

# वेदान्तसारः

## The Essentials of Vedānta Introductory Texts of Vedānta:

The *Vedānta-sāra* of Sadānanda

The *Prameya-ratnāvalī* of Baladeva

A Brief Overview of Advaita Vedānta  
by Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya

Introduced, translated, and annotated  
by  
Neal Delmonico

COMPARISONS

Institute of Advanced Theology, Bard College  
Annandale-On-Hudson, New York  
2002

Copyright 2002 by Comparisons

All rights reserved. No portion of this publication may be duplicated in any way without the expressed written consent of the publisher, except in the form of brief excerpts or quotations for review purposes.

ISBN 1-58684-214-5

Published by:

COMPARISONS

Institute of Advanced Theology, Bard College  
Annandale-On-Hudson, New York 12504

Distributed by:

Global Publications, Binghamton University

State University of New York at Binghamton

LNG 99, Binghamton University

Binghamton, New York, USA 13902-6000

Phone: (607) 777-4495 or 777-6104; Fax: (607) 777-6132

Email: [pmorewed@binghamton.edu](mailto:pmorewed@binghamton.edu)

<http://ssips.binghamton.edu>

# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	ix
<b>Acknowledgments</b>	xv
<b>Introduction</b>	xix
Vedānta . . . . .	xix
Advaita Vedānta . . . . .	xxiii
Sadānanda's <i>Essentials of Vedānta</i> : text and author . . . . .	xxv
Synopsis of the <i>Essentials</i> . . . . .	xxvi
Varieties of Meaning . . . . .	xxxv
The Commentaries, Editions, and Translations . . . . .	xlvi
Inconceivable Difference and Identity . . . . .	xlix
Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa . . . . .	lv
The <i>Necklace of Truth-Jewels</i> . . . . .	lix
Synopsis of the <i>Necklace</i> . . . . .	lxiii
The Meaning of the <i>Necklace</i> . . . . .	lxxii
The Commentaries, Editions, and Translations . . . . .	lxxv

<b>I</b>	<b>The Vedānta-sāra of Sadānanda</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>The Essentials of Vedānta</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	The Preliminaries . . . . .	4
1.1.1	The Qualified Student . . . . .	4
1.1.1.1	The Four Cultivations . . . . .	6
1.1.2	The Subject . . . . .	9
1.1.3	The Relationship . . . . .	9
1.1.4	The Purpose . . . . .	9
1.1.5	The Student's Duty . . . . .	10
1.1.6	The Teacher's Duty . . . . .	10
1.2	Superimposition . . . . .	11
1.2.1	Collective and Distributive Ignorance . . . . .	12
1.2.2	Collective Ignorance . . . . .	13
1.2.3	Distributive Ignorance . . . . .	14
1.2.4	Non-difference . . . . .	15
1.2.5	The Fourth . . . . .	16
1.2.6	Two Powers of Ignorance: the Enshrouding Power . . . . .	17
1.2.7	The Projecting Power . . . . .	18
1.2.8	Causality . . . . .	19
1.2.9	Elemental Creation . . . . .	19
1.2.10	The Subtle Bodies . . . . .	20
1.2.11	The Gross Elements . . . . .	26
1.2.12	The Gross Sense Objects . . . . .	27
1.2.13	The Phenomenal World . . . . .	28
1.2.14	Four Types of Gross Bodies . . . . .	28

1.2.15	The Waking State . . . . .	29
1.2.16	The Greater Manifestation . . . . .	31
1.2.17	The Son as Self . . . . .	32
1.2.18	The Gross Body as Self . . . . .	33
1.2.19	The Senses as Self . . . . .	33
1.2.20	The Vital Breath as Self . . . . .	34
1.2.21	The Mind as Self . . . . .	35
1.2.22	The Intellect as Self . . . . .	35
1.2.23	The Self as Ignorance . . . . .	35
1.2.24	The Self as Awareness and Ignorance . . . . .	36
1.2.25	The Self as Emptiness . . . . .	36
1.3	The Disabusing . . . . .	38
1.3.1	The Great Pronouncement . . . . .	41
1.3.1.1	Co-location (Co-reference) . . . . .	41
1.3.1.2	Qualification . . . . .	42
1.3.1.3	Indirect Signification . . . . .	43
1.3.1.4	Failure of Direct Signification . . . . .	43
1.3.1.5	Indirect Signification Involving Rejection . . . . .	45
1.3.1.6	Indirect Signification Involving Non-rejection . . . . .	46
1.3.1.7	"I am Brahman" . . . . .	47
1.3.1.8	The Mental Event Shaped by Unfragmented Form . . . . .	48
1.3.1.9	Reflected Consciousness Overpowered . . . . .	48
1.4	The Means to Enlightenment . . . . .	51
1.4.1	Listening . . . . .	51

1.4.1.1	The Indicators . . . . .	52
1.4.2	Thinking . . . . .	53
1.4.3	Contemplation . . . . .	53
1.4.4	Concentration . . . . .	54
1.4.4.1	Discriminate Concentration . . . . .	54
1.4.4.2	Non-discriminate Concentration . . . . .	55
1.4.4.3	The Eight Parts of Concentration . . . . .	56
1.4.4.4	Obstacles to Concentration . . . . .	57
1.5	The Living Liberated . . . . .	58
<b>II</b>	<b>The Necklace of Truth-Jewels of Baladeva</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>First Truth-Jewel: Hari is Supreme</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Second Truth: Hari is known by all the Veda</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Third Truth: The Universe is Real</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Fourth Truth: Difference is Real</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Fifth Truth: The Living Beings are Servants of Hari</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Sixth Truth: A Hierarchy Exists among Living Beings</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Seventh Truth: Liberation is Attaining Kṛṣṇa</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Eighth Truth: Pure Bhakti Bestows Liberation</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Ninth Truth: Three are the Sources of Knowledge</b>	<b>121</b>

<i>Contents</i>	vii
<b>10 Conclusion</b>	<b>125</b>
<b>A A Brief Overview of Advaita Vedānta</b>	<b>127</b>
A.1 Orthodox and Heterodox . . . . .	127
A.2 The Meaning of <i>Darśana</i> . . . . .	128
A.3 The Discipline of “Seeing” ( <i>Darśana</i> ) and Vedānta as a Way of Seeing . . . . .	128
A.4 Advaita Vedānta . . . . .	129
A.5 Vedānta’s Three Points of Departure . . . . .	129
A.6 The Highest Principle in Advaita Vedānta . . . . .	129
A.7 Brahman’s Power or Māyā . . . . .	131
A.8 The Seeing and the Seen . . . . .	133
A.9 The Three Categories of Advaita Vedānta . . . . .	135
<b>Glossary</b>	<b>139</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>147</b>
<b>The Sanskrit Alphabet</b>	<b>151</b>
Vowels: Svara . . . . .	151
Consonants: Vyañjana . . . . .	152
Combining Vowels and Consonants . . . . .	156
Compound Consonants . . . . .	157





# Preface

A few years ago I was sitting on an airplane en route to India for a period of research. My project was to spend the next nine months reading commentaries, with Indian scholars, on a Sanskrit text I was in the process of translating. I had read some of the commentaries on my own and knew that parts of them simply escaped me, though my knowledge of Sanskrit was pretty good. I also knew why those sections escaped me. The commentators had written their commentaries for well-educated readers. In spite of the fact that I had a doctoral degree from one of America's finest universities in South Asian Area Studies, I was not what any of the commentators I wanted to read would have considered well-educated. They expected their readers to know Sanskrit grammar like the backs of their hands, to have read Sanskrit literary criticism from beginning to end, to have read and understood the great poetic and dramatic classics of Sanskrit literature. They expected their readers to have studied Indian logic in both its old and new forms, to have read and understood the fundamental texts of Vedānta, to know the fundamentals of Sāṅkhya and Yoga, to have a firm grasp of the classical Vaiśeṣika analysis of the categories and the various types of relationship that connect them, and finally to have studied at least some of the hermeneutic strategies of the Mīmāṃsā school. In short, they expected to be able to depend on a substantial and common fund of knowledge in their readers. They expected to be able to make a brief reference, a few words of a *sūtra* from Pāṇini or the first few words of a verse from Kālidāsa, and have their readers fill in the rest without being forced to waste valuable time and palm leaves explaining what those references meant. I was nowhere near that level.

During that long flight I tested myself to see how much I did know about those subjects. Outside of a few names and dates and some very

sketchy, general ideas and impressions of the subject matter of those various fields, I was ashamed to admit to myself, and I would never have admitted it to anyone else, that I didn't really know much about any of them. The five years of research and writing I had passed through in order to get my Ph.D. had focused me so narrowly on a few texts, writers, and ideas that I did not know enough of the intellectual traditions and discussions that made up the broad horizon those texts were drawn from. What I knew was what I needed to know to write my dissertation and not much more. In addition, I suspected that much the same was true of most, if not all, of my American and many of my Indian colleagues in the field of South Asian Studies. I made up my mind to see what I could do to rectify the situation, at least to some degree, when I got to India.

After settling in to a routine in Calcutta (now Kolkata), where I was to spend the next nine months, I began to inquire into how to go about gaining a solid understanding of at least the fundamentals of traditional Indian learning. What I discovered was that in the traditional system of Sanskrit education, there were books that could be used like steps to ascend gradually to the higher levels of discourse in each of the areas that make up the classical Hindu body of knowledge. Those texts were often taught in a particular order and were aimed at giving a student the tools he needed to make him eventually able to proceed on his own. In the beginning, however, it was strongly recommended that one study them with a teacher. I decided to undertake parts of that course of studies for my own benefit in my spare time. I also decided to focus first on those subjects most likely to impact my understanding of the commentators I was interested in reading. That meant focusing primarily on two schools, Vedānta (Hindu soteriology) and Nyāya-vaiśeṣika (Logic-Atomism). I also discovered that teachers trained in the traditional way who could teach the fundamental texts were becoming rare. The finest and the brightest of Indian students were not replacing them. They instead were going where the money was, engineering and science. Fortunately, however, I found excellent teachers in both schools of thought and one of the results of that period of work is this book, *The Essentials of Vedānta*, a presentation of some of the most basic ideas in Vedānta school of Hindu thought.

As I studied I began to realize that this Vedānta and Nyāya stuff was really pretty fascinating. I increasingly came to feel that not only is this type of study good for those of us in South Asian Areas Studies, it is good

for students in general. What I was learning to do was move gradually, one faltering step after another, into a new world, a world at base very different, but which strangely had many of the same external features as the one I was familiar with. At some point in my study, however, everything clicked into place and suddenly before my mind's eye I found myself standing in the world of the Advaita Vedāntin. It was a breath-taking experience. I could finally see how for numerous centuries brilliant men and women of India could see, accept and inhabit such a world. Though I cannot say that I am now a true believer in the non-dualistic world of Advaita Vedānta, I can say that I now see clearly and dramatically how one could be. It was one of the most rewarding educational experiences I have ever had and it seems to me that something like this should be part of every student's experience. But how?

The only way I can think of is to have the classics of different cultures constantly available before us. Using them, we need to constantly broaden the diversity of the books we read, of the ways in which we think, and of the courses we take and offer, both on the high school and college levels. Those of us educated in the West have become, one might argue, little Aristotles because we have been so deeply informed by the thought of Aristotle,<sup>1</sup> directly or indirectly. So ingrained has his thought become that we hardly ever think of his contributions to our ways of thinking. It is time for Aristotle to read Śaṅkara (Vedāntin), and Gautama (Naiyāyika), and ibn Arabi (Islamic), and Maimonides (Jewish), and Nāgārjuna (Buddhist), and Chuang Tzu (Taoist), and Ju Xi (Neo-Confucianist), and Dogen (Zen Buddhist), and many many others besides. This is of course nothing new, but it is a duty of every generation to remind itself of this necessity. It is especially urgent at a time when people seem increasingly interested in only their own roots and not in those of others. We will know when we are approaching the goal of a really pluralistic education when alongside Plato's analogy of the cave stands Śaṅkara's of the rope and the snake, or Sadānanda's of the forest and the trees or of the lake and the waters; alongside Aristotle's example of Socrates' pug nose sits Sadānanda's one of heated iron. These analogies, metaphors, and examples should be the common treasures of all well educated men and women of the twenty-first

---

<sup>1</sup>One should never lose sight of the fact that Aristotle was once lost to the West. But for his preservation at the hands of Islamic scholars and philosophers, we would know little of his thought.

century.

Simply having a text available in an accessible translation with the added aids of introduction and notes is not by itself enough, however, to bring about the broadening of perspective I underwent (and am still undergoing) in my study of Vedānta. When I try to analyze what it was about my reading that was crucial, the only thing I can come up with is that I approached the texts not as the works of primitive or medieval minds, or of out-of-date thinkers who never read Derrida or Foucault or Zizek, or of thinkers whose ways of thinking have barely made a ripple in the particular currents of history that so strongly tug us along at present. I respected these authors as thoughtful and intelligent men who had used every tool available to them in their times to arrive at fundamental understandings of the nature of reality. In other words, I thought of them as wise human beings who had something important to teach me. I also saw them as possessing the keys with which I might be able to open the doors that would admit me into those higher levels of discourse I encountered in the commentaries I wished to read. They were the focal point of the hope that I might one day sit in community with some of the finest thinkers of India and converse (in Gadamer's sense) with them in their own terms about the matters that animated them the most.

Then (as now) the greatest masters of Indian intellectual history were to me mostly only names: the great Patañjali author of the *Mahābhāṣya*, Jayanta Bhaṭṭa author of the *Nyāya-mañjarī*, Śaṅkara the eloquent founder of Advaita Vedānta, Abhinavagupta brilliant savant of Sanskrit aesthetics and Kāśmirī Śaivism, Śrī Harṣa at the pinnacle of Advaita Vedānta polemics, Udayanācārya penetrating defender of Hindu theism, Gaṅgeśa the logician's logician, Raghunātha Śiromaṇi the crown jewel of logicians, Jagannātha Paṇḍita the final sage of Sanskrit literary criticism, Madhusūdana Sarasvatī virulent defender of the Advaita tradition. These are only some of the brightest stars. One cannot break down their doors and rush in, American and arrogant, on such masters and expect them to meekly hand over their precious thought-jewels. One is unlikely to get away with that even if one were Indian and arrogant. More likely than not one will only come away with glass imitations of their treasures, worthless except to those enchanted by anything that sparkles.

It is arrogance and superficiality that closes and locks the doors of that

elevated discourse. It was my own arrogance that made me think that I knew a lot about India because I was granted a doctorate by a university's president, who knew nothing about India herself, but who was invested with authority by others who knew even less. If one indeed follows the trail of invested authority that operates behind the granting of university degrees, one finds that it quickly evaporates into nothing, like some foggy boggy mist. The only things left behind are one's self-admiration and a pretty piece of paper. In Vedāntic terms, it is a good example of the operation of *māyā*, to cover and to project, creating a threatening snake out of a harmless piece of rope. As Plato has taught us, only when one is humbled and shorn of pretense, does one's real education begin.

My starting point for learning Vedānta was the *Vedānta-sāra* (Essence of Vedānta) by Sadānanda Yogīndra, one of the works presented here and the first step on the stairway to Advaita Vedāntic heaven. I have also taken the second step, namely the *Vedānta-paribhāṣā* of Dharmarājādhvarīndra. In the future I hope to attempt the third step, the first four *sūtra* of the *Brahma-sūtra* with Śaṅkara's commentary and Vācaspati Miśra's sub-commentary. Beyond that looms the *Vivaraṇa-prameya-saṅgraha* by the formidable Vidyāraṇya Bhāratī, the fourth step, like a massive, blue mountain in the distance. Perhaps I will never make it all the way into the company of the great sages of Indian culture, somewhere off on the heights of Mount Meru. The steps will be left behind, however, for others to follow. Maybe some of you will be determined enough to reach the top and converse with some of those sages. The works presented here are only the first step in a journey that is like climbing the mighty Himalayas. Those who do not make it all the way, however, will nevertheless have strengthened their minds and gathered some valuable jewels of understanding from their efforts.



# Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to acknowledge my deep gratitude and profound indebtedness to two great Sanskrit scholars without whose help I would not have been able to write this book. The first of those scholars is Dr. Minati Kar, head of the Department of Sanskrit at Visvabharati University, Santiniketan, West Bengal, India. Professor Kar gave selflessly of her time to read with me the first of the texts translated here, Sadānanda's *Vedānta-sāra*, along with another Advaita Vedānta text, the *Vedānta-paribhāṣā* of Dharmarājādhvarīndra. We read and discussed these texts together during a nine month visit I made to Calcutta (now Kolkata) for research in the 1993-94 academic year. She faced a profoundly dull intellect hardened by an almost unrelenting stubbornness and yet she still managed to implant some of the fundamental ideas of Advaita Vedānta in it. Certainly, anything I have gotten right in that part of this book is due to her incredible patience and fine teaching, and any mistakes here are to be blamed solely on me. I consider myself extremely fortunate to have worked with such a fine scholar. I hope that Dr. Kar will be pleased when she sees the work I have done here.

I was placed in the care of the second great Sanskrit scholar back when I was on the Wisconsin Junior-Year-in-India Program in 1978. Since I expressed an interest in Sanskrit studies in my application to that program I was directed to Professor J. Prabhakar Shastry. At first I resisted because I was under the impression that the best of Sanskrit teachers were to be found in Varanasi, the ancient center of Hindu and Buddhist civilization. I am glad that I was overruled and sent to Waltair in Andhra Pradesh, because from Shastry I have received an immeasurable wealth of Sanskrit learning, as well as a deep respect for the greatness of India's classical civilization. As part of the project that I did for the Wisconsin Program I read

and translated, under Shastry's guidance, the second text in this book, the *Prameya-ratnāvalī* ("Necklace of Truth-Jewels"), of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa along with another work by the same author, the *Siddhānta-darpana* ("Mirror of Conclusion"). Apart from that, Shastry started me off on a course of studies in Pāṇinian grammar, using a special approach that he had devised. Though I was unable to complete the whole course, the part I did complete provided me with a solid foundation in Sanskrit that has served me well over the intervening years. He, too, had to face a massive, almost bovine dullness, but as everyone knows, Hindus love cows and thus he never lost patience with me and even managed to give me an inkling at least of the greatness that *is* India. He has continued to encourage me throughout the years and that encouragement has finally paid off in the second part of the book before you. I hope that Shastry will be pleased and gratified to see some result from all of the hard work he put into trying to teach me.

At this point I should recognize my indebtedness to the institutions that have funded the work I did in India. At the top of that list is the American Institute of Indian Studies (AIIS). I believe I have received every possible category of grant that that institute offers to American students and scholars: a language fellowship (Bengali, 1983), a junior (dissertation) research fellowship (1985-6), and a senior research fellowship (1993-94). It was on the last fellowship that I was able to read with Dr. Kar in my spare time. The research that I was funded for will be published separately in the near future. I should also mention that the funds for the last fellowship, though administered by the AIIS, came from a grant from the Smithsonian Institute. In addition to funding, the AIIS gave me tremendous assistance in numerous other ways as I went about doing my research and living in Calcutta during those years. I am specially grateful to Mr. Tarun Mitra, Director of the Calcutta office of the AIIS, for his friendship, humor, and (often) sound advice, and to Mrs. Aditi Sen who replaced Mr. Mitra in that capacity. She has been the very soul of encouragement and helpfulness. The second program I would like to recognize is the Wisconsin Junior-Year-in-India Program, which, though it didn't fund me, gave me a priceless opportunity to live and study in India in 1978. It was then that I met and studied Sanskrit grammar with J. Prabhakar Shastry. The Wisconsin Program performs the extremely valuable service of introducing American college students to the rich and varied culture of India, and the



AIIS creates and supports ways in which American students and scholars can explore in more depth the fascinating civilization of India. Long may they run!

Finally, I would like to thank all my friends both in the United States and in India. Among those in India, I am specially grateful to my good friend Sajal Majumdar, without whose constant supply of tea, *mudī*, and diversion I would have certainly lost my sanity. Among my friends in the United States, I wish to thank Dr. Ramesh Rao with whom I have had many interesting and edifying conversations, as we walked out at the lake, on topics related to this book. Some of those discussions are reflected in the introduction of this book. Another good friend of mine, Dr. Mythreyi Shastri, has been a constant source of encouragement and inspiration for me over the years of our friendship. Like her namesake, the great Upaniṣadic woman sage Maithreyī, she is the very embodiment of the desire to know (*jijñāsā*). I thank the members of my family, specially my parents Tony and Vivian, who have borne the burden of listening to me talk about finishing this book for years and who, truth be told, probably thought I never would. No matter what they secretly thought, they nevertheless continued to humor me so that I never stopped thinking I would finish. I thank my daughter, Jahnavi, for her tremendous patience and sweetness. She had many occasions to exhibit those when, having come to ask me to read to her or for a tickle, she found me either too busy or too grouchy. Thanks to my step-son, Tim Otten, for helping me set up the “nix”-based systems and network at home on which I wrote and formatted this book. Last, but not least, I thank my dear wife, Elizabeth Otten Delmonico, who has had to read through this work more times than I care to think of and probably more times than she cares to remember. Her encouragement, questions, comments, and editorial help have made it an enormously better work than it otherwise would have been.



# Introduction

## Vedānta

The works translated here are texts that have been used for centuries in India to introduce the fundamentals of the religio-philosophical traditions collectively known as Vedānta. Vedānta means the “ends” or “final parts” of the Veda which are a collection of ancient texts, written in a precursor of the Sanskrit language called Vedic, and which are invested with the highest religious authority by all orthodox Hindus.<sup>2</sup> Composed, compiled, and collected into their present form between roughly 1500 B.C.E

---

<sup>2</sup>Acceptance of the authority of the Veda, in fact, is one of the few defining characteristics of orthodox Hinduism. One might conclude from this that non-acceptance of the authority of the Veda is therefore a defining characteristic of heterodoxical Hinduism and that therefore Buddhism, Jainism, and Materialism (Cārvāka) are merely forms of heterodoxical Hinduism, but this is not so. Those traditions, in spite of having so much in common, are usually viewed as distinct from Hinduism. In traditional accounts of the schools of philosophy, the *āstika* or the “there is” schools are distinguished from the *nāstika* or “there is not” schools. The meaning of those terms has changed over time, but for the purposes of this book, the distinction made in the *Laws of Manu* (मनुस्मृति or मनुसंहिता) will be used. There, the “there is” schools are those that affirm the truth of the Veda and the “there is not” schools are those that deny the truth of the Veda. The former will be referred to as Hindu. “Hindu” is a word that first appeared as a Persian geographical term that applied to the peoples living beyond the Sindhu river (now in Pakistan). Unable to pronounce the “s” or the aspiration in “dh,” Sindhu became Hindu in the mouths of Persian and later Arabic speakers. Some scholars claim that the use of the word Hindu as a way to refer to the religion and culture of the dominant Indic community or constellation of communities, or for the “there is” schools in other words, does not occur until the middle of the 19th century. This is incorrect, however. The word Hindu is used in the 16th century in vernacular texts in much the same sense as it is today, that is, to refer to the community that accepts the authority of the Veda and that follows the traditions and practices that grew out of them. The *Caitanya-bhāgavata*, for instance,

and 600 B.C.E., the Veda can be counted among the oldest surviving religious/poetic texts in the world. Understandably, over the nine hundred years or so of their compilation a number of religious changes took place in the community that held the Veda as sacred, and those changes are represented in the diverse materials that make them up. The Veda began as hymns, instructions, and chants for use in the performance of various sacrifices, which were the main forms of religious practice among the early Aryan (“noble”) peoples who, according to the predominant theory, migrated into India sometime before 1500 B.C.E. However, the Veda reveal a gradual change of focus from the performance of ritual sacrifice, essentially meals offered to the gods and then shared by the sacrificial community, to the cultivation of a salvific knowledge, a knowledge that penetrated beyond the sacrificial rites to the powers or power that underlay them and that made them effective. This process began with what has been called the “interiorization” of sacrifice,<sup>3</sup> a process whereby the rites themselves, which had become tremendously expensive and complex, were at first homologized and eventually identified with physiological processes like breathing and eating. This process culminated in the idea that one could get the same benefit as performing a sacrifice by merely knowing the secret of its power or meditating on it. At first, knowledge of the underlying meanings of sacrifice was emphasized and then attention shifted to knowledge of the underlying meanings of reality itself. The final parts of the Veda, known as the Upaniṣads, represent the culmination of this process. They thus embody the first tentative forays into questions of truth, being, and meaning of a civilization that would later produce hundreds of philosophic and religious classics on those subjects.

Of the 108 traditionally recognized works that bear the name Upaniṣad, thirteen are generally recognized as the most ancient and authoritative. Among them seven are considered the oldest and are assigned to

---

which was written about 1546 C.E. uses the word numerous times (at 2.23.108, 1.11.80-81, 3.4.55 to cite only a few, numbering from Dr. Radhagovinda Nath’s edition). There may be even earlier examples of the self-referential use of the word Hindu by Hindus. Since those referred to by this word long ago adopted it as a name for themselves, I will use it here to refer to the “there is” schools of Indic philosophy. See Flood, *An Introduction to Hinduism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 6.

<sup>3</sup>Eliade, *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958), pp 111-114.

the period roughly between 800 and 600 B.C.E.<sup>4</sup> The others, though later (maybe as late as 200 B.C.E. in the case of the *Maitri Upaniṣad*), were early enough or became respected enough to gain wide acceptance by the tradition. The balance of the 108 Upaniṣads are made up of mostly sectarian works that are much later in date of composition and quite different in style and teaching. They in general do not have as broadly-based an acceptance as the “original” thirteen. As new sects grew up in Hinduism over time, each one sought and “found” support for its beliefs in one or more of the sectarian Upaniṣads and could then push forward a claim to being supported by the authority of the Veda. What basically distinguishes the “thirteen” from the rest of the “108,” then, is their breadth of acceptance as religious authorities. Almost all traditions accept the thirteen as authoritative whereas the acceptance of the other Upaniṣads is uneven. The Upaniṣads, thus, make up the first of what the later Vedāntic tradition has called the three “points of departure” (*prasthāna-traya*).<sup>5</sup>

“Vedānta,” then, generally refers to the teachings of the thirteen principal Upaniṣads and was later extended to other works about or based on them. Although this makes for a fairly well circumscribed group of religious texts, there is a great variety of viewpoints expressed in those thirteen, and that has fostered a great variety of interpretations. A number of schools of interpretation grew up in the period after the “canonization” of the Upaniṣads, schools that tried to promote a particular interpretation of the texts as the one most faithful to the texts themselves. The earliest surviving attempt at finding a unified connection between the diverse viewpoints of the Upaniṣads is a work called the *Brahma-sūtra* (“Aphorisms on Brahman”) attributed to a sage named Bādarāyaṇa.

The *Brahma-sūtra* developed in an age in the history of Indic philosophy (roughly 200 B.C.E. to 600 C.E.) in which the six classical “schools” of philosophy, called *darśana* or “visions of, ways of viewing, reality,” were

<sup>4</sup>The earliest are the *Aitareya* and *Kauṣītaki*, which belong to the Ṛg Veda; the *Taittirīya*, *Brhad-āraṇyaka*, and *Īśa*, which belong to the Yajur Veda; and the *Chāndogya*, and *Kena*, which belong to the Sāma Veda. See Olivelle, *Upaniṣads* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), fig. 1, facing page xxx.

<sup>5</sup>The three “points of departure” are the Upaniṣads, the *Brahma-sūtra*, and the *Bhagavad-gītā*, representing revelation (*śruti*), reasoning (*tarka*), and tradition (*smṛti*), respectively. Anyone who claims to be a Vedāntin, no matter which school of Vedānta he belongs to, must begin from those works or, in other words, show that his views have the support of those works.

developing. The six traditional *darśana* are Mīmāṃsā (Vedic Hermeneutics), Vedānta, Nyāya (Logic), Vaiśeṣika (Atomism), Yoga (Meditation), Sāṅkhya (Enumeration Metaphysics). Each of them systematically formulated their viewpoints through works composed of *sūtra*, short, concise statements, literally “threads,” sometimes called “aphorisms” in English. *Sūtra* can be easily memorized and condense within themselves a great deal of thought and teaching. They were apparently didactic tools used in the schools to teach the tenets of their philosophies. Though easily memorized, the *sūtra* are not so easily understood. Understanding the full meaning of a *sūtra* work required the help of an explanation from a teacher who had himself studied the *sūtra* from a teacher. Eventually those explanations were turned into written commentaries and the most authoritative of the commentaries became recognized as the major commentary or *bhāṣya*. Traditionally there was one *sūtra*-work for each of the six schools. The *Brahma-sūtra* is the *sūtra*-work of the school of thinkers who accepted the Upaniṣads as the highest religious and philosophical authority, and its author attempts to interpret the Upaniṣads by resolving conflicting passages and presenting a unified teaching built upon the diverse statements of the texts. Through the *Brahma-sūtra*, then, the school of Vedānta distinguished itself from the other schools that were developing.<sup>6</sup> Though these other schools did not deny the authority of the Upaniṣads or of the Veda, they developed different “views” of reality which did not depend for their authority on the Upaniṣads, but which were presented as harmonious with them.

Unlike the five other schools, in which one *bhāṣya* on the *sūtra*-work dominated, diversity developed within the “view” called Vedānta. As the fundamental and authoritative interpretation of the principal Upaniṣads, the *Brahma-sūtra* became the subject of a number of competing commentaries in the course of time. It, thus, became the second “point of departure” for the tradition and, in fact, may well be the most com-

---

<sup>6</sup>The *sūtra*-work of the Sāṅkhya school has been lost. What now passes under the name *Sāṅkhya-sūtra* is a much later replacement. Instead, the *Sāṅkhya-kārikā* or “Verses on Sāṅkhya” of Īśvarakṛṣṇa has taken the place of the *sūtra*-work as the most authoritative presentation of the Sāṅkhya school of thought. The *Yoga-sūtra* of Patañjali with its *bhāṣya* by Vyāsa and the *Nyāya-sūtra* of Gautama with its *bhāṣya* by Vātsyāyana are the foundational works of the Yoga and Nyāya schools. The remaining two orthodox schools are the Atomistic (Vaiśeṣika) and the Ritualistic/Hermeneutic (Mīmāṃsā), each of which have extant *sūtra*-works, the *Vaiśeṣika-sūtra* of Kaṇāda and the *Mīmāṃsā-sūtra* of Jaimini.

mented on work in the history of Indic philosophy. A number of different sub-schools of Vedānta grew up, each with its own main commentary or *bhāṣya* on the *Brahma-sūtra*. The later tradition developed titles for all of those different sub-schools of Vedānta based on the school's position on the fundamental question of the relationship of Brahman (the supreme truth recognized in the Upaniṣads) to the living being (you and me and all other forms of life). These include Advaita (non-dualism), Viśiṣṭādvaita (qualified non-dualism), Dvaita (dualism), Dvaitādvaita (dualism and non-dualism), Śuddhādvaita (pure non-dualism), and others. As one can see, the various positions of the interpreters cover almost the whole spectrum of the conceivable possibilities (and some inconceivable ones as well). If one were to ask where the author of *Brahma-sūtra* itself should be placed in this spectrum, each school would of course claim his sympathy. An excellent study that, unfortunately, has received little attention suggests that the *sūtra*-work has more affinities with the "dualism and non-dualism" (Dvaitādvaita) schools, but recognizes that on the whole the *sūtra* themselves are too vague to draw a system out of and probably represent merely a stage of development in Vedānta on its way to a full blown philosophical system.<sup>7</sup>

## Advaita Vedānta

The most powerful of the sub-schools of Vedānta is the one that the first text translated here belongs to, the Advaita or non-dualistic school of Vedānta (from *a-dvi* meaning "not two"). The greatest teacher of that tradition, one might even say its founder, was Śaṅkarācārya, who was born before or about 700 C.E. and lived a short life of either 32 or 38 years.<sup>8</sup> His commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra* is the earliest belonging to the Advaita school and became the foundation of the later Advaita tradition. Śaṅkarācārya, himself, claimed that he belonged to an older tradition and

<sup>7</sup>V. S. Ghatge, *The Vedānta* (Poona: The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, repr. 1960), pp. 156-170.

<sup>8</sup>See Paul Hacker for this date in *Philology and Confrontation* edited by Wilhelm Halbfass (Albany: State University of New York, 1995), p. 27. Deutsch and van Buitenen present the traditional date of 788 C.E. in *A Source Book of Advaita Vedānta* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1971), pp. 122-23.

referred to his teacher, Govinda, and to his teacher's teacher Gauḍapāda, but we have no earlier work from the Advaita perspective except for one of Gauḍapāda, the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* ("Verses on the *Māṇḍūkya*"), a problematic work of verses (*kārikā*) that form a commentary on the *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. Some argue that Gauḍapāda was either himself Buddhist or was influenced by Buddhism.<sup>9</sup>

The Advaita school teaches that the primary proposition of the Upaniṣads is that the living being (known as the *jīva*) and the supreme, impersonal being (Brahman) that underlies all things are one and the same. The difference that we perceive between ourselves and everything else is only an apparent difference and is based on ignorance (*avidyā*). This ignorance, however, is not merely an absence of knowledge. It is an entity or power of some sort belonging to Brahman that cannot be described and that is capable of not only covering the truth, but also projecting something else upon what it has covered. It can be dispelled, nevertheless, by knowledge of the identity that exists between the living being and the ultimate being, Brahman.<sup>10</sup> While this is not the only viewpoint on the meaning of the Upaniṣads, it has a firm foundation in some of the texts and has proven to be one of the most resilient and influential of them all. The other sub-schools of Vedānta, being later than Śaṅkarācārya's, have always had to contend with the Advaita interpretation in order to defend and establish their own views. It makes sense, then, to begin a study of Hindu religion and philosophy with the study of Advaita Vedānta even if one's ultimate aim is the comprehension of one of the many other traditions of Hinduism. Even the other schools of Vedānta, which are usually theistic and therefore opposed to the non-dualistic interpretation of Advaita, often have their students begin the study of Vedānta with the Advaita school. The text that is generally recommended is the one translated here, the "Essentials of Vedānta" (*Vedānta-sāra*) by Sadānanda Yogīndra.

In *Necklace of Truth-Jewels* (*Prameya-ratnāvalī*) of Baladeva, the second text translated here and discussed in more detail later in this introduction, we will get a glimpse of the other end of the spectrum of interpretation of

---

<sup>9</sup>Flood, *An Introduction to Hinduism*, p. 240.

<sup>10</sup>See Appendix A for a more detailed description of the overall philosophy of Advaita Vedānta by a great modern pandit and scholar of the tradition, Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya Śāstrī.



Vedānta, namely the Dualistic or Dvaita school.<sup>11</sup> It is hoped that between these two texts readers will get some sense of the variety and breadth of the Vedāntic tradition in the philosophical and religious life of Hinduism.

## ***Essentials of Vedānta: text and author***

Not much is known about Sadānanda Yogīndra, the author of the *Sāra* (pronounced “saw-ra”). From the works that he cites his dates can be placed no earlier than the 15th century C.E. There are three early commentaries on the work that have been published. One of them, the *Subodhīnī* by Nṛsiṃha Sarasvatī, is dated 1588 C.E. and may be the work of a disciple of a disciple of the author of the *Sāra*. If that is so, then Sadānanda may be placed in the first quarter of the 16th century C.E., thus coming fairly late in the Advaita tradition.<sup>12</sup> Apart from that, nothing more is known of him.

The work is short (only about 15 pages of printed text)<sup>13</sup> and is written in clear and easy Sanskrit. This has no doubt contributed to the text’s popularity as an introduction to the Advaita doctrine and practice. It presents in a straightforward and structured way the main “truths” (*prameya*, “that which is knowable”) of the Advaita tradition. This it does without any explicit discussion of the ways in which those truths are arrived at or can be supported, that is, without discussion of the means of knowing (*pramāṇa*) used to establish the truths of the tradition. For that discussion, the student must turn to the second and more advanced work that is traditionally used in training new members of the tradition, the *Vedānta-paribhāṣā* (“Explanation of Vedānta”) by Dharmarāja Adhvarīndra (16th century). Initially, however, it is most important to get the basic ideas down and leave the sometimes quite complex and subtle questions of justification

---

<sup>11</sup>Actually Baladeva belonged to the Inconceivable Difference and Non-difference (*acintya-bhedābheda*) school. Nevertheless, he cites with approval and organizes his text around the teachings of the Dvaita school even though the teachings of his own tradition differ somewhat.

<sup>12</sup>Hiriyanna, p. 17.

<sup>13</sup>In Hiriyanna’s edition, for instance. See the bibliography.

and validity for later.<sup>14</sup> Accordingly, the author of this text sticks to the basic truths of the tradition and does so in an inclusive manner. That is, when he comes to a point on which there is disagreement within the Advaita tradition itself, he includes the differing views. Thus, he includes the two major sub-traditions of interpretation in the Advaita tradition, the Vivaraṇa and the Bhāmatī schools, by providing examples that are fitting for each.<sup>15</sup> The text, therefore, can be used as an introductory text by both.

## Synopsis of the *Essentials*

The *Sāra* begins as most Indic philosophical and religious texts do with a verse in praise of one of the gods or the ultimate truth as the author conceives it. Here, the author seeks shelter in the unfragmented “Self”

---

<sup>14</sup>It is obvious from the procedure adopted by Sadānanda in presenting the conclusions of his tradition that four sources of knowledge are recognized: direct perception or experience, inference, comparison, and testimony. Testimony, which involves citing the texts of the Upaniṣads as proof of one’s position, holds the highest authority. Two other sources of knowledge are available to the Advaitin, postulation and non-cognition, but those are not as clearly represented in this text.

<sup>15</sup>These two traditions refer to the two major differences of interpretation of Śaṅkara’s commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*. One of them, the Bhāmatī tradition, grew out of the commentary on Śaṅkara’s *bhāṣya* by Vācaspati Miśra (9th century C.E.). It was named *Bhāmatī*, supposedly after Miśra’s wife. The Vivaraṇa school refers to the commentary of Prakāśātman Yati (11th cent. C.E.) called the *Pañcapādikā-vivaraṇa*, which is actually a sub-commentary on the commentary of Padmapāda who was a direct disciple of Śaṅkara. There are many differences between those two interpretations. The major one for the purposes of the text translated here arises in the way the living being is viewed with respect to its identity with Brahman. The Bhāmatī tradition understands the living being to be consciousness or Brahman delimited by ignorance. The Vivaraṇa school sees the living being to be consciousness or Brahman reflected in ignorance. The first is called the delimitation view, the second the reflection view. In the text the first is represented by the forest and its trees. The forest occupies a certain space and each tree occupies an even more limited space. Brahman is the fullness of space, the Lord is the space occupied by the forest, and the ordinary living being is the space occupied by a tree. Though the last two spaces have different limitations, as space they are essentially the same as the fullness of space. The Vivaraṇa viewpoint, in contrast, is represented in the text as the reservoir and its waters. The same sky is reflected in a whole reservoir and in a small part of its waters. The sky represents Brahman, its reflection in the reservoir is the Lord, and its reflection in a small part of its waters is the living being. The latter of these interpretations was the one most favored by the Advaita tradition as a whole.

(*ātman*), in other words, Brahman, the unitary, supreme, impersonal being that underlies the universe. That Self is described as eternal being, joy, and consciousness and as the very foundation of all that is. This sort of verse is called a “performance of auspiciousness” (*maṅgalācaraṇa*). It is an act of worship or expression of faith that has the effect of clearing the way of obstacles to the completion of the work and often gives the reader a brief indication of the subject of the work.<sup>16</sup> In the second verse, Sadānanda offers his obeisance to his own teacher, Advayānanda, thereby recognizing his indebtedness and simultaneously establishing the authority for the text he is about to present.

The author then proceeds systematically to define Vedānta, the qualified student of the system, and the nature of the relationship between the student and the teacher. Following those preparatory remarks the instruction begins in earnest with the introduction and development of the central idea of superimposition (*adhyāropa*). Superimposition is the imposition of something that is not real on something that is real. The example that is often given is that of the imposition of the idea of a snake on the reality of a rope that occurs when one mistakes a rope for a snake. The snake is not real because there is no real snake present. There is only a rope present and therefore it is what is real. The situation of mistaking a rope for a snake is thought to be similar to the way, according to Advaita Vedānta, we, through ignorance, mistake motionless, undivided, impersonal Brahman for a world of seemingly infinite diversity. That is, an unreal world of multiplicity is superimposed on the reality of undifferentiated Brahman.

A great deal of the discussion that follows in the text describes in some degree of detail how superimposition takes place through the influence of a mysterious power called *māyā* that creates appearances. That power is also referred to as ignorance (*avidyā*) and cannot be described, for although it “is” in some sense, it cannot be described as either being or nonbeing. The covering and projecting aspects of that power result in us and the world we see around us. The full details of that evolution can be gotten from the text itself and need not occupy us here. It should only be pointed out how well the text succeeds in connecting together several different ideas about the nature of phenomenal existence that occur in different

---

<sup>16</sup>The reader’s or student’s way is also thought to be cleared of obstacles.

Upaniṣadic passages. Ignorance is viewed as having collective and distributive influences that parallel each other. The collective influence brings out of Brahman the Lord (be it Viṣṇu, Śiva, or Śakti), and the distributive influence brings about ordinary living beings like you and me. Both categories, Lord and living being, are Brahman characterized or limited or clouded by ignorance.<sup>17</sup> The process of world manifestation involves first the covering of pure, unbroken consciousness (Brahman) by ignorance in the form of a wrapping (*kośa*) of joy,<sup>18</sup> a process that results in the manifestation of the super-subtle “causal” bodies of the Lord and the living being. Then, as a result of ignorance’s power of projection, the five subtle elements (space or ether, air, fire, water, and earth) are produced and out of them arise the gross elements and gross bodies composed of those gross elements. The subtle body is the body of transmigration<sup>19</sup> and the gross (i.e. physical) body is the temporary abode of the transmigration-body. That process is related in the text to the Upaniṣadic teaching of the five wrappings that cover the inner self like the layers of clothing, and also to the doctrine of four states of consciousness (waking, dream, deep sleep, and the “fourth”) that make up the different levels of the self’s experience.

The effects on consciousness of this general process of evolution are made apparent in the text in the descriptions of the different ways in which the true Self is mistaken for those projections of ignorance (paras. 97-108). In a hierarchy ranging from the one most confused (who identifies the son with self) to the one least confused (who identifies emptiness with self), each example of confusion is associated with an opposing philosophical position (either actual or contrived). Therefore, the world is full of people who confuse the self with a variety of things that are not the self. The

---

<sup>17</sup>In this introduction and the translation that follows I generally have used the words characterized, characterization, and character to translate *upahita*, *upadhāna*, and *upādhi*. These words are very important to the project of the Advaita tradition. They are often translated as limited, limitation, and delimiter. My use of the word characterization instead should be taken in the sense of giving character or characteristics to something. The imposition of character on the otherwise characterless Brahman by *māyā* or ignorance is what makes the unlimited ground of being appear limited and possessed of discrete and diverse characters.

<sup>18</sup>I am translating *kośa* as “wrapping” instead of the usual word “sheath,” which in English usually refers to the covering of a sword.

<sup>19</sup>The subtle body has seventeen limbs or parts: the five knowledge-gathering senses, the intellect and mind, the five action senses, and the five vital breaths. See para. 57 and following.

Advaitin (the non-dualist) alone understands the true nature of the self, i.e. that it is none other than inner consciousness. All the other things that attract some claim to being the self are merely objects, like pots, because they are themselves revealed (that is, made known) by consciousness. Thus, inner consciousness which is eternal, pure, awakened, free, true, and self-luminous is the true Self. That having been established, the author of the text turns next to the counteraction or disabusing (*apavāda*) of the confusion of other things with the Self. He describes how, confronted with correct knowledge, effects disappear into their causes in a great cosmic devolution that ultimately results in disappearance of the cloud of ignorance covering Brahman and the simultaneous dissolution of Lord and living being into their true state of being, Brahman.<sup>20</sup>

The discussion turns next to what are identified by the Advaita tradition as the “great statements” (*mahāvākya*) of the Upaniṣads. The greatest of them all is the statement: “you are that” (*tat tvam asi*, lit. “that you are”) which is repeated nine times in an important passage of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (6.8-16). The pronunciation of this great statement by the teacher to his student represents the culmination of his teaching. The teacher is telling his student that he (the student) is identical with Brahman which is the referent of the word “that” in the statement. As the author points out, all of the instruction on superimposition and the disabusing that occupies the first two thirds of the *Sāra* has as its main purpose the clarification of the two terms “you” and “that” in the great statement. If the student has understood that discussion well, when the teacher tells him “you are that,” a realization dawns on the student and he responds with “I am Brahman” (*aḥam brahmāsmi*) the second great statement of the Upaniṣads, this one

<sup>20</sup>This points to the peculiar Advaitin notion of causality. Some scholars (Chatterjee and Datta) call this view of causality *satkārya-vāda*. *Satkārya-vāda* is the belief that the effect is already existent in the cause. As a result, an effect is really only a transformation of the cause and after destruction returns to its cause. Cause and effect are essentially identical. The school of Sāṅkhya presents the best example of this line of thought with its acceptance of the idea of transformation (*pariṇāma*). Some schools of Vedānta accept the idea of transformation, too. Advaita Vedānta, however, does not. Instead, it holds the view of apparent transformation (*vivarta*). Ultimately, the effect is not real. When the unreality of the effect becomes known it disappears leaving only the cause, like the vanishing of the snake when one discovers it is a rope. Because destruction in the Advaita tradition is a later state that becomes identical with the former state (पूर्वावस्थातादात्म्या-पन्नोत्तरावस्था), it only superficially appears like *satkārya-vāda*. See the entry in *Bhāratīya Darśana Koṣa*, vol. 3, part 1, for *satkārya-vāda*.

from the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (1.4.10).

If the discussion of superimposition and the disabusing elucidate the “that” and the “you” of the *tat tvam asi* statement, the discussion that occurs next in the text (paras. 113-122) focuses on the meaning of “are” (*asi*). How are Brahman and *ātman*, so different on the face of it, to be understood as identical? The statement “you (the limited living being) are that (the unlimited, pure Brahman)” appears at first to be nonsensical. How can such a statement be meaningfully understood? The author takes up a discussion of some important techniques of interpretation that must be applied to the great pronouncement in order that it can be understood in the way the Advaitin thinks it should be. The discussion turns therefore to the topic of direct signification (*abhidhā*) and indirect signification (*lakṣaṇā*). A sentence may signify directly, by which is meant according to the literal meanings of the words of the sentence and their syntactic relationship, or it may signify indirectly, by which is meant according to an implication that is based on the literal meanings of the words of the sentence and their syntactic relationship. One may not choose between these two ways of signification according to one’s whims, however. The indirect means can only be applied if the direct means fails in some way. The classic example of the application of indirect signification is supplied in the sentence “the village resides on the Ganges” (*gaṅgāyām ghoṣaḥ prativasati*). It is obvious to everyone that the village cannot literally be located on (or in) the river Ganges itself. One therefore must supply another meaning, one that is implied in the sentence, that the village is located not on the Ganges itself, but on one of its banks. That second meaning is the one that is arrived at through indirect signification.

The situation is similar in the case of “you are that”. The “you” and the “that” are radically different, the “you” being a severely limited and fully characterized form of consciousness and the “that” being a completely unlimited and uncharacterized form of consciousness. They, therefore, cannot be meaningfully identified. But that is what the statement attempts to do on a literal level. Since the literal meaning fails, some form of indirect signification must be called into operation, and the discussion turns to which of the various types of indirect signification applies here. The author offers the form of indirect signification known as “partial” indirect signification (*bhāga-lakṣaṇā*) as the form in operation here. Partial signification is also known as “rejection/non-rejection” indirect signification

(*jahad-ajahal-lakṣaṇā*). It is so called because part of the meaning of each of the terms being equated is rejected and part of it is retained. Thus, the part of the “you” that means limited and characterized and the part of the “that” that means unlimited and uncharacterized are rejected and the parts that mean consciousness are retained. Since the only part of the meaning of the two words, “you” and “that”, that remains after the rejection is consciousness, there is no problem identifying them. Through partial indirect signification, then, the statement “you are that” becomes a meaningful sentence that identifies the living being with supreme Brahman.

Sadānanda turns next (paras. 123-127) to the statement of realization “I am Brahman” (*aḥam brahmāsmi*), the second great pronouncement of the Upaniṣads according to the Advaita tradition. That statement is the verbal form of a special kind of mental operation, an operation said to have assumed the shape of unbroken form (*akhaṇḍākārākārita*) or, in other words, the form of the whole. Ordinarily, a mental operation occurs when the internal instrument (*antaḥkaraṇa* or mind) traveling out through the various sense organs takes the form of an object. The object then becomes known because the ignorance covering it is removed when the operation takes the object’s form and the reflected consciousness of that mental operation reveals what the object is. The mental operation described by “I am Brahman,” however, is unlike any other mental operation in that the object it takes the form of is Brahman itself. All other objects are broken or delimited into distinct, clearly defined objects like pots or plates. This one, however, is unbroken or unlimited. When the mental operation removes the ignorance covering that unbroken form, root ignorance is removed and along with root ignorance all of its effects are removed. The author tells us that it is like the burning of a cloth when the threads, the cloth’s causes, are burned. Now, one of those effects of root ignorance is the internal instrument that has taken the shape of unbroken form. When that mental operation, which is like a mirror, is impeded along with the impeding of its cause, only pure, unbroken consciousness remains, just as when a mirror that bears the reflection of one’s face is broken and what had appeared to be two (i.e. one’s own face and the mirror’s reflection) becomes one. This is the way realization of one’s identity with Brahman occurs according to the *Sāra*.

The focus turns next (paras. 128-145) to the set of practices that lead up

to, and should be performed until, the powerful moment of direct Brahman experience: hearing, considering, contemplation, and concentration. The first three components of practice come from the famous recommendation of the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (2.4.5): “the Self indeed is to be seen, heard of, thought about, contemplated, Maitreyi!” Seeing the Self refers to the direct experience of Brahman and is given first not as a practice, but as an indication of the ultimate goal. The process actually begins with hearing, continues with considering or reflecting on what has been heard, advances to contemplation or meditation on what has been heard and reflected upon, and draws close to its culmination in concentration or a trance-like absorption in the non-dual substance. The practice of concentration (*samādhi*) is taken from the discipline of classical *yoga*, the other parts of which are also adapted to the end of bringing about the ultimate realization of the Advaita tradition, the direct experience of Brahman.

The process of hearing, according to Sadānanda, is one of properly interpreting the Vedānta texts and involves paying attention to indicators in the texts that point to their proper meaning. These indicators are the opening statement, the closing statement, repetition, novelty, result, glorification, and justification. It is thus a system of hermeneutics the correct application of which according to the Advaita tradition will demonstrate clearly that, while there are a number of diverse statements in the Vedāntic texts, they are ultimately only about the non-dual substance.

Considering or reflecting involves the use of argument or reasoning to support the meaning of the Vedānta texts already discovered in hearing. It therefore confirms and strengthens the convictions established during hearing. Contemplation is turning one’s flow of awarenesses from things other than the unbroken substance, like physical or mental objects, to things related to the unbroken substance. Concentration is either discriminate or nondiscriminate depending on whether or not there is an awareness of subject-object dichotomy. The absence of the dichotomy signals the higher stage of nondiscriminate concentration. This is not itself the experience of Brahman, but it is the closest thing possible. What separates this from Brahman realization is the persistence of a subtle mental operation which may or may not be noticeable. In the experience of Brahman the mental operation, too, is eliminated when its cause, root ignorance, is eliminated. From nondiscriminate concentration it is but a short leap to Brahman realization.



The eight constituent practices of classical *yoga*<sup>21</sup> are presented next as “limbs” or means of reaching nondiscriminate concentration. These are restraint, observance, posture, breath-control, withdrawal, fixation, meditation, and concentration. The only major change in the practices associated with *yoga* is the focus on non-dual substance that becomes the exclusive object of fixation, meditation, and concentration. The practices of *yoga* then become applied to the ends of the Advaita tradition.

Of particular interest, however, are the four obstacles to nondiscriminate concentration that are recognized and discussed in the following section (paras. 146-152). As the proof text, a citation from Gauḍapāda, demonstrates, those are not borrowed from the practices of yoga, but rather extend back to the beginnings of the Advaita tradition. The first of the obstacles is dissolution (*laya*) which is apparently falling asleep while trying to concentrate. One commentator attributes it to laziness of the mind in concentration which, while not being distracted by external things, does not actively focus on the internal self.<sup>22</sup> The second obstacle, distraction (*vikṣepa*), is being distracted by external objects, causing the mind to be drawn away from the non-dual substance. Third, being tinged (*kaṣāya*) is what happens when latent impressions left from past experiences tinge the mind and paralyze it or stop it from focusing on the non-dual substance. A commentator compares it with a man who leaves his home in order to see the king, but is stopped short by a guard at the gate of the court. Having left aside the external sense objects, a practitioner may still be stopped by the subtle internal traces of past experiences.<sup>23</sup> Those traces (in Sanskrit either *vāsanā* or *saṃskāra*) are typically considered the sources of memories and aesthetic experience. The final obstacle is indulging in joy or bliss. It amounts to becoming hung up on the level of discriminate concentration in which one experiences an intense joy, and therefore not advancing to the higher stage of non-discriminant concentration. A commentator compares it with the situation of a person who is after a treasure and who, while not actually laying hold of the treasure yet, finds it not protected by ghosts.<sup>24</sup> The absence of undesirable things like the treasure’s protecting

<sup>21</sup>By classical *yoga* I mean the system of *yoga* presented in the *Yoga-sūtra* of Patañjali (2nd century B.C.E.) which is the first systematic treatment of the practice of *yoga* and the fundamental text of that school of Indian philosophy.

<sup>22</sup>Nṛsiṃha Sarasvatī, *Subodhinī*, para. 147.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., para. 149.

<sup>24</sup>Buried treasures are often believed to be protected by ghosts (*bhūta*) in India. Stories

ghosts produces a great joy in him. Similarly, one on the level of discriminate concentration, while not having experienced the unending joy of the unbroken substance, experiences a joy produced by the cessation of the undesirable external manifestations and mistakes it for the joy of Brahman.<sup>25</sup> One's advancement is thus halted. For the problem of dissolution, one should awaken the mind; for distraction one should control the mind drawing it away from external objects; for the tinged condition one should understand its source and not force the mind towards the non-dual substance; and one should avoid indulging in joy by remaining aloof through the wisdom of being able to distinguish between the real joy of Brahman and the joy arising from the end of undesirable things. One who successfully overcomes the four obstacles develops a mind that is unwavering, like a flame in a windless place.

The final section of the text is about those who have achieved liberation before the ends of their lives, that is, the living liberated (*jīvan-mukta*). A person who is liberated is situated in Brahman, that is, is entirely intent on it, and is free of all bonds. One is freed from all bonds because, as we saw, in the direct experience of Brahman, root ignorance and its effects are falsified by knowledge. In terms of the Hindu world-view, this means that the results of one's past actions, which glue one to the world and generate one's future bodies and experiences, are destroyed. Therefore, there is no future rebirth for the living liberated. The only thing that remains are the results of past actions that have already begun to fructify. Those are the results that have created the current life circumstances, the current body, and the current set of experiences. Because they are already in effect they are not destroyed when the rest are destroyed. When they are exhausted in the course of the remaining lifetime of the liberated person, that person achieves final liberation, becoming finally and irreversibly one with Brahman.

The *Sāra* attempts to give us some insight into the psychology of someone who is liberated while living. It is not that the liberated one becomes unconscious of his body and his surroundings. After experiencing Brahman the living liberated sees the actions being performed by his body,

---

abound of kings or wealthy men burying their treasures to keep them from the hands of their enemies. Along with the treasure, servants or soldiers are buried to protect the treasures as ghosts.

<sup>25</sup>Nṛsiṃha Sarasvatī, para. 150.

senses, and mind under the influence of the latent impressions of his past actions, but does not see them as real. It is like someone knowledgeable watching a magic act. He sees the magic, but does not think of it as real. He thus becomes something like an indifferent observer of actions and reactions that he has no connection with. Also, one need not worry that one who is liberated will then act however and say whatever he wishes believing that nothing can affect him any longer. Just as the physical functions of eating and sleeping that existed before liberation continue after it, so, and the text gives us two possibilities here, the auspicious latent inclinations or traces will continue, or the liberated person will become indifferent to both auspicious and inauspicious tendencies. In either case the liberated one will behave. Moreover, all of the means to knowledge and the good qualities will continue to be present in the liberated one like so many ornaments. Then living only to complete the journey of his body, when the already active results of his past actions are exhausted, the life force of the liberated one dissolves into the highest Brahman and only Brahman remains. This completes the journey of the living being towards liberation.

## **Varieties of Meaning**

The next question to be entertained about this text and its tradition is one of interpretation. What does it mean, what can it mean for thoughtful people, both Hindu and non-Hindu, at the beginning of the twenty-first century? There are a number of possible answers to this question which is after all a question of where one locates the truth in this system of teachings. Some, of course, will find it true in its own terms; others will find it true, but perhaps not in the way its author and community thought it true. Still others will find it true, but only for what it reveals of the ways in which its community of faith saw itself on the backdrop of the world, and perhaps beyond that for what it reveals of how other communities of faith might see themselves in relation to the world. Let us reflect on each of these in turn.

The Advaita Vedānta tradition presents a powerful vision of the nature of reality and one that makes a strong claim to truth. Its claim to truth is perhaps on firmer ground than those of the pseudo-historical religious traditions of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Modern textual criti-

cism, archaeology, and science have discredited much of what the Bible, for instance, teaches as truth.<sup>26</sup> The Vedānta makes no serious historical claims as evidence of its validity, but instead operates in the realm of metaphysics. It makes no difference if textual criticism and archaeology can demonstrate that the Veda and especially their final portions, the Upaniṣads, are not eternal, but had their origins some two and a half to three millennia ago and were written by certain individuals. Those “origins” are only the most recent manifestations of the eternal Veda, the Vedāntin may argue, and those individuals are the sages through whom they are revealed, not their authors. It makes no difference if science has gone far beyond the simple five-element understanding of matter; that is only a refinement of the basic schema of gases, solids, liquids, energy, and space. The five are part of the common experience of non-specialists and are sufficient for them in their daily lives. Sub-atomic particles and black-holes are merely parts of *māyā*’s wonderful cosmic display and thus are neither real nor unreal nor ultimately describable. More importantly they have nothing to do with the truly real. The principles of the Vedānta’s metaphysics: superimposition of ignorance onto Brahman, the disabusal from that ignorance through knowledge, the oneness of Self and Brahman, the possibility of liberation while living, and so forth are trans-historical. They are true for and can be known by anyone, past, present, or future. One does not need a special revelation from an Abraham, Moses, or Muhammad to know the truths of the Vedānta. What is more, the study and practice of Vedānta leads to an overwhelming and transforming experience that the Vedāntin claim many have had. All of this points to the truth of the Advaita Vedānta teaching. Still, if you don’t believe it, try it out and you will realize it for yourself, they say.

Anyone who has walked, either actually or sympathetically, some distance down the path of Advaita Vedānta, far enough at least to get a glimpse of the Advaitin’s world, will be able to attest to what a powerful vision of reality it is and to what a relief and joy the transforming experience of Brahman must be. As part of that experience the burden of one’s fears, disappointments, anxieties, losses, frustrations, and limi-

---

<sup>26</sup>For the most radical presentation of this evidence against historicity see Thomas L. Thompson, *The Mythic Past: Biblical Archaeology and the Myth of Israel* (Basic Books, 2000). Another work on this subject is Phillip R. Davies, *In Search of Ancient Israel* (Cornell University Press, 1995).

tations is lifted off one's shoulders and one realizes one's true nature as unending consciousness and joy. In that moment when one realizes that there is no "other," one's fear vanishes for it is the "other" that one feared and even when the "other" was a source of joy, as the "other" often is, that joy was always contaminated with fear. The joy of Brahman is unlimited and uncontaminated by fear. This experience, however, so important to the validation of the tradition, points to an important difficulty the tradition has in establishing its claim to truth. Unfortunately, the very traits that immunize Vedānta from being seriously challenged by textual criticism, archaeology, and science also prevent it from establishing itself as true. There may well be an experience of liberation or identity with Brahman, but no matter how powerful and transforming it is, it will always remain a private experience that can never be publicly validated. It thus can never be the datum needed for publicly shared authentication. As one of the great Vedāntin and Hindu renunciants, Agehananda Bharati, has said so well:

... private experience of an object of the religious sort does not confer existential status on the object or more simply ... from the fact that a saint sees God, or the Goddess, or Kṛṣṇa, or Rāma, or identifies himself with Brahman, the existence of God, of the Goddess, of Kṛṣṇa, or of Rāma, or of the Brahman does not follow.<sup>27</sup>

This is, of course, not a problem unique to Vedānta. Numerous religious traditions face the same difficulty in pushing their claims to truth. In sum, then, while the Vedānta, free of some of the vulnerabilities of other traditions, cannot be easily falsified, it nevertheless requires a leap of faith that involves the acceptance of the authority of the Veda and especially of the Upaniṣads as revelations of the true nature of reality. If one is able to take that leap one can accept the Vedānta as true in its own terms.

The Vedānta might also be accepted as true in terms other than those conceived of by its authors and communities. There are several ways, for instance, in which the Vedānta can be seen as prefiguring some of the modern views of reality. As one interpreter of Hindu theology, Jose Pereira,

---

<sup>27</sup>Agehananda Bharati, *The Ochre Robe* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1970), p. 237.

points out, there are a number of “archetypes” or modes of thought that existed in India long before they appeared in the West. Among them is a sense of the immensity of time and space that fits far better with modern scientific understanding of cosmology than anything available in the West before the 17th century. He quotes the great scholar of Buddhism Edward Conze who says:

The Europeans of the 17th century were quite unaware that ‘the wise men of the bygone ages’ in India had for a long time already done justice to the immensity of time and space, not, however, through *marvelous discoveries and clear demonstrations* [emphasis as found], but through the intuitions of their cosmic imagination.<sup>28</sup>

Even a radically materialistic interpretation might be proffered. We generally tend in our day to day activities to operate as if we were separate entities, apart from the rest of what there is in the world. In reality, however, we are continuous with and inseparable from the rest of universe. What occurs in the world or in any region of the universe profoundly affects us and we in turn affect it. There is thus an underlying oneness that has differentiation imposed on it. The matter of which we are composed is the same matter that composes the universe; it flows into and out of us. We are like temporary eddies in this flow of matter and yet we regard these eddies as distinct and unique, ignoring the flow and its lesson of intimate connection with the whole. Thus might one who is a radical materialist interpret the Advaita Vedāntic teaching in materialistic terms without too much difficulty.

There are, and have been for some time, a number of books out attempting to connect the ancient Vedic tradition, of which the Vedānta forms an important part, with modern physics and scientific theory. These works are generally written by Hindu revivalists who are often trained scientists attempting to recover or “rediscover,” for themselves and others, the wisdom and value of their ancestors’ ancient traditions. A recent

---

<sup>28</sup>Jose Pereira, *Hindu Theology: a reader* (New York: Image Books, 1976), p. 26. The citation of Conze is from his *Buddhism: its essence and development* (New York: Harper, 1959), p. 49.

example of this kind of approach can be found in the book *Vedic Physics: the scientific origin of Hinduism* by Raja Ram Mohan Roy.<sup>29</sup> He claims that the Vedic scriptures contain a complex cosmology that is presented in code and that this cosmology has a scientific basis in the sages' yogic experience of the interconnections between all levels of reality, human, earthly, and cosmic. As fanciful as such a claim may seem, Roy has expended great effort and shown great cleverness developing his theme, based on his rather far-fetched interpretations (many would call them misinterpretations) of the Vedic texts, and has found a small but vocal circle of followers. Since many of the terms of the Vedic texts are interpreted as code words for the terminology of modern physics, this type of interpretation falls into the category of finding truth in terms other than those used by the authors of the tradition.

Roy's work is only among the most recent in a tradition of interpretation of Veda and Vedānta that stretches back for nearly a century. An early and more sophisticated example of the same tendency can be found in the work of Swami Pratyagātmānanda Sarasvatī, whose name was Pramathanath Mukhopadhyaya before his renunciation. He was born in 1881 and died in 1973. A professor of science during his working years, he devoted his efforts to showing the scientific foundations and implications of the ancient Indian scriptures. He wrote in English, Bengali and Sanskrit, producing some forty works during his long life. His major work is *Japasūtra*, a six-volume work in Sanskrit with a Bengali commentary, on the "science" of *mantra* (incantation) and *tantra* (rite). His earliest work in this area, *India: her cult and education*, was published in 1915.<sup>30</sup> His major work on the relationship of the Vedic and Tantric traditions to physics is found in his book *The Metaphysics of Physics; the background of modern cosmological conception in Vedic and Tantric symbolism* (1964).<sup>31</sup> Much of his work centered around an attempt to connect the Vedic symbolism and specifically notions of sound as vibration (*mantra*) with ideas current in modern physics. Again, the foundation of Swami's work is in the idea that the writers of the ancient texts, the sages, had access to a special form of perception that

<sup>29</sup>Raja Ram Mohan Roy, *Vedic Physics: scientific origin of Hinduism* (Toronto: Golden Egg Publications, 1999).

<sup>30</sup>Pratyagātmānanda Sarasvatī Swami, *India: her cult and education*, in *The Complete Works of Swami Pratyagatmananda Saraswati* (Calcutta: Saranam Asram, 1980).

<sup>31</sup>Pratyagātmānanda Sarasvatī Swami, *The Metaphysics of Physics: the background of modern cosmological conception in Vedic and Tantric symbolism* (Madras: Ganesh, 1964).

arises as the result of yogic practices. By that form of perception they were able to know the basic structures of reality, in part because of the intimate connections between the microcosmic and macrocosmic realms of that reality. What can be known and experienced around one and inside of one applies with equal validity on a large scale to the cosmic realm. Similarly, what one does on the microcosmic level has repercussions on and influence over the macrocosmic. This is an ancient idea in India and can be found in ancient religious modes of thought in other cultures as well. As we have seen with these two examples the idea is alive and well today.<sup>32</sup>

A final example of the possibility of finding truth in the Advaita Vedāntic perspective in ways not imagined by its framers comes from some recent developments in the realm of chaos theory. Recently two Australian scientists made the claim, based on computer simulations, that this universe is based on nothing but randomness. To cite the opening paragraph of a recent article in *New Scientist*

If you could lift a corner of the veil that shrouds reality, what would you find? Nothing but randomness, say two Australian physicists. According to Reginald Cahill and Christopher Klinger of Flinders University in Adelaide, space and time and all objects around us are no more than the froth on a deep sea of randomness.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup>There are many more examples of this type of interaction of some neo-Hindus with their ancient traditions. This urge to either blend modern science with ancient wisdom or discover scientific truths already expressed in those traditions must be a strong one today indeed for books are constantly appearing with this as their goal. A little known, but interesting book called *Anita's Legacy: an inquiry into first cause* by GURPUR M. PRABHU (Ames, Iowa: Viresh Publications, 2000), a computer scientist teaching at an American university, is an example in which the author tries to present a similar message in the form of a narrative set in the United States and involving primarily Americans. Another good example of such an attempt is found in the work of Dr. V. Lakshmikantham, a distinguished professor of mathematics, called *The Origin of Human Past: children of immortal bliss* (Mumbai: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1999). The physicist Amit Goswami, has written *The Self-aware Universe: how consciousness creates the material world* (New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam, 1993) in an attempt to apply Advaita Vedānta concepts to the world described by modern physics. All of these writers are sophisticated scientists and mathematicians attempting to reinterpret aspects of their Hindu religious tradition in the light of modern science or vice versa. Of course, there are plenty of examples from other religious traditions as well.

<sup>33</sup>*New Scientist*, Saturday 26 February 2000.



Randomness might be seen as another way of referring to Brahman. Like Brahman randomness is indescribable, without character, laws, or limitations. As in the case of Brahman the world and all its contents rest upon randomness like foam upon an ocean, yet randomness is not directly perceived. It is even possible to account for our experience of the present (i.e. consciousness) in the theory developed by the two scientists. Unlike in Einstein's theory, the future does not already exist. It is in the process of being created by randomness. This may seem far-fetched, but there are enough similarities at the least to give one pause. One has to ask, however, should it be claimed that randomness and Brahman are harmonious or even the same, what Vedānta has contributed to this development or what it has to contribute. Sometimes, however, a mere change of perspective, such as that often referred to as the Copernican revolution, is all a discovery needs.

The final option for interpreting Vedānta involves passing over the two options already mentioned and settling on the certainty, however minimal it might seem in comparison to the other two, that the Vedānta was and still is *believed* to be true by its authors and its community. Since there seems to be very little empirical evidence of its truth (one might even say that empirical evidence contradicts it), one has to ask what it is that recommends the Advaitic interpretation of reality to its community of belief. In order for it to have remained and flourished it had to appeal to some aspect of the lives and experiences of its community. A premise I wish to put forward is the idea that, whatever else one may claim for it, religion is an intimate part of our fantasy lives. Putting aside the possibly unanswerable question of its truth or falsity, the most powerful aspect of religious belief may be found in its role in the realm of fantasy. There are a great many things that one can recognize as true. It is true that the sun appears to rise every day in the east, but that in itself has no particular appeal to fantasy. In religious belief, however, the most important element may be the element of fantasy. The truth claims that all religious belief-systems present function more to support, and in many cases to disguise, the fantastic dimensions of those religious world-views. Viewed from this perspective, the Advaita Vedānta presents an extraordinary fantasy, one that in many ways outstrips even the egocentric Christian fantasy of an omnipotent, omniscient, transcendent god who, of all things, "loves me." According to Advaita Vedānta, though currently ignorant of our great estate, we *are* the

supreme. Many in the West would blush at such a suggestion and perhaps even cover their ears, yet they would not even blink at the incredible self-inflation of the Christian fantasy. Why do some fantasies appeal to some and not to others? Both of these fantasies are at base narcissistic, yet they assume different conceptions of the nature of person.<sup>34</sup> In the Western case, the conception of the person is individualistic, at least since the Reformation. In the case of India one might say that the person is viewed not as an individual, but as a "dividual."<sup>35</sup> This is to say that the units of person-hood are differently delineated. In India, in so far as it has not been influenced by the West, the unit of person-hood is the extended family or perhaps the community. Persons in those entities are merely parts or limbs of the larger being. The family or the community is like a giant with many heads, eyes, and feet, to borrow an image from an ancient Vedic hymn.<sup>36</sup> Whatever happens to the larger entity affects the parts and whatever happens to the parts affects the larger entity. There is a sense of self, a sense of connectedness, tying this huge and scattered entity together and a nostalgia for that mythic time when all those heads, eyes and feet were connected in one body, before the great dismembering sacrifice that created this world and scattered the limbs of that being abroad.<sup>37</sup> Advaita Vedānta extends this model beyond the various families and communities to include all living beings.

Religious fantasies often exist in tandem with particular social and cultural environments and in many cases are inversions or reversals of those environments. Thus, one has to look at the social and political environment of the Vedāntic teaching of the identity of self and Brahman in order to understand some of its appeal. Out of the rigidly stratified and brutally differentiated social structure of ancient and medieval India arose the great fantasy of underlying identity and equality. By social structure I am of course referring to the infamous caste system which was probably devised originally by the *brāhmaṇa* caste as a way of integrating incursive

---

<sup>34</sup>For an excellent study of the narcissism of non-dualism in Hinduism see *The Oceanic Feeling* by Jeffrey Masson (Dordrecht, Holland, Boston: D. Reidel Pub. Co. 1980). For a classic account of Christian narcissism (though before Freud's time) see *The Essence of Faith according to Luther* by Ludwig Feuerbach, translated by Melvin Chernoff, (New York: Harper & Row, 1967).

<sup>35</sup>I borrow this term from McKim Marriott.

<sup>36</sup>Rg Veda, 10.90, the *Puruṣa-sūkta*.

<sup>37</sup>The *Puruṣa-sūkta* again.

groups of new people, invaders or peaceful migrants, into the central society while maintaining their own distinctiveness and the distinctiveness of each of these groups. In short, it is ancient India's version of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, except that the goal was not to create a "melting pot," but to preserve the individual cultures and practices of each of the groups. The system appears to have worked well enough and to be one of the reasons why civilization in India has survived for close to three thousand years in an unbroken continuity. All the different groups occupy a place in the social hierarchy and have a function that is viewed as contributing to the well-being of the society as a whole. The details of this system are managed from the top by the *brāhmaṇa* who in their roles as priests and literati control the flow of divine blessing and divine information. The system is an inclusive hierarchy;<sup>38</sup> the groups are kept separate by restrictions on intermarriage, and participation in a particular group depends on birth. Each of these elements is important for the maintenance of the system. The hierarchy provides a powerful mechanism of control, the restricted intermarriage allows each group to maintain its distinctiveness, its own sub-culture, and inclusion by birth guarantees the passing on from generation to generation of the accumulated family wisdom and skills that contribute to strengthening the function of

---

<sup>38</sup>By inclusive hierarchy I mean a hierarchy in which the higher categories are higher because they are considered more complete, more whole. They thus include the lower categories which are thought of as issuing out of them. The lower categories are less complete because they are more clearly defined or characterized and less adaptable. An example of this kind of inclusive hierarchy is found in this text in the issuing forth of the elements from each other. The progression is from subtle to gross, from bright to dark, from active to dull. In addition, a process of mixing produces the really gross elements. Thus, all the castes and their functions are contained in the *brāhmaṇa* caste. When they are differentiated out, each caste is capable of performing its own function, but not the function of the other castes. The *brāhmaṇa* is capable of performing all roles as is evident in the legal texts in which the *brāhmaṇa* are allowed to take on the work of any of the lower castes in times of difficulty. As the great law text of the Hindu traditions, the *Laws of Manu* (मनुस्मृति, 1.93, trans. by Buhler) says:

As the Brāhmaṇa sprang from (Brahman's) mouth, as he was the first-born,  
and as he possesses the Veda, he is by right the lord of this whole creation.

The *brāhmaṇa* then represent pure and undifferentiated humanity, full of potential whereas the lower castes are differentiated and limited, mixed, as with the gross elements. The other castes are given dominion over certain sub-regions of creation, but the *brāhmaṇa* own it all.

the group in the larger society. Thus, musicians become better musicians and artisans better artisans, etc, partially for genetic reasons and partially for environmental reasons. Underlying the hierarchy is a conception of ritual purity which extends into the realms of food and personal cleanliness. Those at the top of the hierarchy are also felt to have the greatest ritual purity, ritual purity being required for interaction with the sacred. They are, according to Manu (1.94), the very mouths of the gods. What they eat the gods also enjoy. Those wishing to rise higher in the hierarchy must demonstrate to those at the top, through their patronage and adoption of ritually pure habits, that they qualify for being accepted as higher. This very rarely happens and it happens not to individuals, but to whole communities. Without exception individuals remain in the caste that they are born into. All in all it was an extraordinary system, a rather daring, thought-provoking, and, given the Indic historical context, a wise experiment in human social organization. As with all rigidly hierarchical forms of social organization, however, the caste system promotes inequality, cruelty, and a kind of racism rarely seen on the face of the earth. It is perhaps in the recognition of the dark side of the social reality that the fantasy of fundamental equality or identity finds its richest soil.

One can imagine how a fantasy of fundamental identity might operate in various segments of the Hindu society, appealing to each in different ways. To the *brāhmaṇa* at the top, it offers both solace and challenge. The reminder that at the most fundamental level, the level of the true and abiding self, there is no difference between him and the lowest of corpse-carrying outcastes places a severe strain on his pride of position and tradition. The recognition that all of his *brāhmaṇa* qualities for which others bow at his feet inhere only in his body and have nothing to do with who or what he really is is bound to be humbling. That in and of itself might not be considered a very pleasant experience, but it must be remembered that this kind of teaching, while alluded to in other stages of life, is usually reserved for the final stage of life, when the *brāhmaṇa* leaves home to lead the life of a renunciant or ascetic (*sannyāsa*). At the end of a *brāhmaṇa* man's life, it is recommended in the law texts that he perform his own funeral and leave home to lead a life of detachment as a wandering, homeless ascetic. This stage of life is devoted to realizing one's identity with Brahman and gaining liberation from the cycle of repeated birth and death. It appears to have been appropriated from the Jaina and the Buddhist monas-

tic traditions and was institutionalized by Śaṅkara, the great teacher of the Advaita Vedānta tradition, in the system of the ten orders of renunciants (*daśanāmin*). One seeks in this homeless life to find peace in oneself and with the world, and the fantasy of identity must appease much of the guilt one must feel, consciously or unconsciously, for a lifetime spent engaged in the violence of putting others in their places, in having them step aside to let one pass on the path. Where is there room for guilt if the one putting down and the one being put down are really one and the same? The whole world with its ups and downs becomes a play or a game with interchangeable parts, all played by the same being. No real harm has or can be done.

For the non-*brāhmaṇa* the teaching is one of encouragement. One is assured that as bad as one's current position may be, it is only transitory and that one is in true nature, if not physical nature, as great as any *brāhmaṇa*. It is thus a fantasy of power for those who are weak and a fantasy of absolution for those who are powerful, a fantasy of fearlessness for those who are frightened and one of joyfulness for those who are disappointed. It is the complete opposite of the stratified, complex, unkind social world in which its authors and their community lived. Armed with such a fantasy, lives that probably seem not to amount to much are transformed into meaningful, maybe even beautiful lives for those who live them. Apparently, the transformative power of the Advaita religious perspective is just as great today as it has been in the past, not only in India, but also in the West where it has been spread in various forms through various avenues.

## The Commentaries, Editions, and Translations

The *Vedānta-sāra* has three major commentaries: the *Subodhinī* (Easy Instruction), the *Bālābodhinī* (Instruction for Children or Beginners), and the *Vidvanmanorañjanī* (Pleasing to the Minds of the Learned). The first of the commentaries is by Nṛsiṃha Sarasvatī who was, as mentioned before, possibly a disciple of a disciple of Sadānanda and who claims to have completed the work in 1588 C.E. It is by far the easiest of the commentaries and often provides interesting and picturesque examples meant to illumine the teaching of the text. Some of those examples I have worked into the fabric of the synopsis of the text. The second commentary is by the

great teacher of the Mīmāṃsā school of Hindu philosophy, Āpadeva (1650 C.E.), whose major work is the *Āpadevīya* or the *Mīmāṃsā-nyāya-prakāśa* (Light on the Logic of Mīmāṃsā). In his commentary on the *Vedānta-sāra*, which is the shortest of the three, he sticks to the topic of Vedānta and in some places carries the discussion to an advanced level. His commentary is in some places the most difficult of the three. It is also the most conservative. An example of its conservatism is found in the discussion of the *adhikārī*, the qualified student of Vedānta.<sup>39</sup> Āpadeva glosses the word “knower” (*pramātr*) with “*brāhmaṇa* men who have good habits” and cites a text that states that women, *śūdra* (the lowest caste) and friends of the twice-born are not allowed to study the Veda. He goes on to say that the famous Upaniṣadic woman Maitreyī who was taught about Brahman by her husband, Yājñavalkya, is only an example of praise or glorification (*arthavāda*) not a teaching to be taken seriously. He admits, however, that not all *brāhmaṇa* are qualified to study Vedānta, only those who have the four cultivations (*sādhana-catustaya*). The other two commentators take a broader view of who is qualified to be a student of Vedānta, Nṛsiṃha Sarasvatī pointing to Vidura, the knower of Brahman mentioned in the great epic the *Mahābhārata* who was a *śūdra*. Rāmatīrtha merely uses the word *jīva* which means any living being.<sup>40</sup> Rāmatīrtha, the author of the third commentary, was one of the teachers of the great Advaitin Madhusūdhana Sarasvatī (1650 C.E.) who wrote one of the masterpieces of the Advaita tradition, the *Advaitasiddhi* (The Establishment of Non-dualism). Rāmatīrtha was also a disciple of a teacher named Kṛṣṇatītha. His commentary is the largest and pushes the text far beyond its elementary and introductory bounds. Thus, the three commentaries augment the text in their own ways.

There have been a number of editions of the *Vedānta-sāra* with various of its commentaries. A list of many of the editions can be found in the Bibliography. The edition that I primarily used for this translation is the one by Brahmacārī Medhācāitanya which includes the text, a Bengali translation of the text, and all three commentaries in Bengali script.<sup>41</sup> Since

<sup>39</sup>Paragraph 6 and the commentaries on it.

<sup>40</sup>Rāmatīrtha characterizes the “knower” as a living being who is unmistaken in worldly and Vedic matters.

<sup>41</sup>Brahmacārī Medhācāitanya, ed. *Vedānta-sāra* (Kalikātā: Śrī Rāmakṛṣṇa Vedānta Maṭha, 1980).

there are sometimes misprints in the Medhācāitanyā edition, I often consulted the text as printed in Hiriyanna's edition, which contains the text in Devanagari script and Hiriyanna's fine English translation.<sup>42</sup> Two other editions have been useful for checking the readings of the commentaries. The first is the edition done by Col. G. A. Jacob which contains both the *Subodhinī* and the *Vidvanmanorañjanī*.<sup>43</sup> The second edition I have referred to is the one brought out in 1911 by the Śrī Vāñī Vilāsa Śāstra Series which contains only the commentary of Āpadeva.<sup>44</sup> The latter edition is of special interest because it contains a long (100 pages) essay in response to some of the claims and criticisms made by European scholars, specifically Thibaut and Jacob, on the subject of Vedānta. We see here one of the many examples of a powerful native response to the patronizing study of important texts of Indic philosophy and religion by the missionaries and their supporters, whose major purpose was to try to demonstrate the bankruptcy of Hinduism.

The *Vedānta-sāra* has a long history of translation. The first English translation of the text appeared nearly two hundred years ago in 1811, the work of William Ward, a missionary at the Shreerampur mission north of present day Calcutta. Ward's translation was not, however, done from the original Sanskrit. It was done from a Bengali translation made by an unknown *paṇḍita* in the employ of the mission or commissioned by it. The Bengali translation is interesting in its own right as it is one of the earliest surviving examples of Bengali prose. In 1811 Ward published a large work in four volumes entitled *Accounts of the Writings, Religion, and Manners of the Hindoos: including translations from their principal works* and his translation of the *Vedānta-sāra* appeared in the first volume.<sup>45</sup> The next translation of the work came out in 1850 and was done by J. R. Ballantyne. Another translation of the text came out in *The Pandit*, a monthly journal published in Benares, in 1873 and one by Col. G. A. Jacob after that entitled *A Manual of Hindu Pantheism*. The third edition of Jacob's translation was included in *Trubner's Oriental Series* in 1891. In 1929 one of the best translations was

<sup>42</sup>Hiriyanna, M., ed. and trans., *Vedānta-sāra* (Poona: Oriental Book Agency, 2nd ed. 1962).

<sup>43</sup>Jacob, G. A., ed. *The Vedāntasāra of Sadānanda, together with the commentaries of Nṛsiṃhasarasvatī and Rāmatīrtha*. (Bombay: Tukārām Jāvajī, 1894)

<sup>44</sup>*Vedantasara of Sadananda* (Srirangam: Sri Vani Vilas Press, 1911).

<sup>45</sup>Caṭṭopadhyāya, Sunīlakumāra, ed. *Ekṭi duṣprāpya Bāmlā gadya puṁthi: Vedāntasāra* (Shreerampur: Council of Shreerampur College, 1984), p. 12.

published, the translation, with extensive notes, made by the great scholar of Indic philosophy, Mysore Hiriyanna. The most recent translation of the text is that of Swami Nikhilananda, published initially in the 1930s. It has been re-edited and republished numerous times since then and is still available from the Advaita Ashrama.

One might wonder why a new translation is needed of a work that has been translated so many times before. Any translation of a difficult and profound text like this is only an approximation. None of them capture the text exactly or in the fullness of its wisdom and no translation probably ever will. Nevertheless, every generation should make an attempt to grapple with the great classics of the past. The last translation of the text was made some seventy years ago and it is about time to try to present another that will give it a voice more adequate to the end of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first century. Hopefully, each new translation, building on the strengths and attempting to correct the weaknesses of its predecessors, will be an improvement over the earlier ones, a closer approximation of the original or a more full hearing of what the author of the text had to say. That at least has been the object of my work on this translation. It is through a process something like this that we have come to an ever better understanding of many of the ancient classics of Western civilization, classics like the works of Plato or Aristotle. The *Vedānta-sāra* and other fundamental works of Indic philosophy and religion certainly deserve prominent places among such works, especially in an ever shrinking world in which national cultures are being replaced by a shared world culture and history. There is no justifiable excuse for educated men and women of the twenty-first century not to know something about Vedānta, or the *Bhagavad-gītā*, or the *Tao Te Ching* or *Popul Vuh*, to use examples from other philosophic and religious traditions. As for learning some of the basics of Vedānta, there is no better place to begin than with the *Vedānta-sāra*. Beyond that it is hoped that some of these young men and women, after reading the *Sāra*, will become curious enough to dig deeper into the subtleties of this extraordinary system of metaphysics.



## The Vedānta of Inconceivable Difference and Non-difference

At about the same time that Sadānanda was composing his *Vedānta-sāra*, far down the Ganges, almost where the great river meets the Bay of Bengal, a religious revival was taking place. The leader and center of this revival was a charismatic and intensely emotional devotee of Kṛṣṇa whose renunciation name was Śrī Kṛṣṇacaitanya (Caitanya for short).<sup>46</sup> It is interesting to imagine that the two men may have passed each other on the streets of Varanasi during Caitanya's visit there. Born into a *brāhmaṇa* family in 1486 C.E. in the town of Navadvīpa as Viśvambhara Miśra son of Jagannātha Miśra, Caitanya sparked off a religious movement that swept through Bengal and spread to other parts of India within a century. That movement of enthusiastic devotion to Kṛṣṇa and to Rādhā, Kṛṣṇa's feminine consort/power (*śakti*), still continues today, most noticeably in Bengal and around the ancient town of Mathurā in India's northern state of Uttar Pradesh. Over the last century or so, as a result of the work of several zealous and talented gurus, the tradition has spread in various incarnations to all parts of the world.<sup>47</sup> Although Caitanya was well educated and was a teacher in the traditional Indic school system for a while, he never wrote much himself. Instead he attracted as followers some of the leading talents of his time and asked them to write the philosophical, theological,

<sup>46</sup>By renunciation name, I mean the name that he took when he entered the renunciant's stage of life (*sannyāsa*). The greatest of the biographies of the saint Caitanya, *The Immortal Acts of Caitanya (Caitanya-caritāmṛta)* written by Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja (16th century), has recently been published by Harvard University Press. The translation from the Bengali is by Edward C. Dimock with the assistance and editing of Tony K. Stewart.

<sup>47</sup>Perhaps the first guru of this tradition to come to the United States was Premānanda Bhāratī in 1902. His book *Sree Krishna: the lord of love*, published in 1904, did reasonably well and was later republished by William Ryder and Sons, Ltd., London, in 1912 (?). See "Bābā Premānanda Bhāratī (1857-1914), An early twentieth-century encounter of Vaiṣṇava devotion with American culture: a comparative study" by Gerald T. Carney in *Journal of Vaiṣṇava Studies*, vol. 6, no. 5, Spring 1998. Another important Caitanyite teacher, Mahanamabrata Brahmācari, completed his doctoral degree at the University of Chicago in 1935. There are a number of representatives of this religious tradition who spread the faith in the West these days. The most high profile group, unfortunately one with questionable authenticity, has been the International Society of Krishna Consciousness (ISKCON) or Hare Krishna Movement, founded by A. C. Bhaktivedānta Swami in the 1960s.

and ritual works that became the foundation of the religious tradition.

There is a popular verse that summarizes a commonly held view of Caitanya's main teachings. It is found at the beginning of a 16th century commentary on the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* called the *Treasure Chest of the Opinions of Śrī Caitanya* (*Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā*) by Śrī Nātha Cakravartin. It is as follows:

The Lord who is the son of the king of Vraja is to be worshiped and his home is Vṛndāvana. The form of worship devised by the wives of Vraja is the most pleasing. The *Bhāgavata* is the purest source of knowledge. Selfless love (*preman*) is the highest goal of human life. This is the opinion of the great master Śrī Caitanya. To that we give our greatest respect.<sup>48</sup>

The “son of the king of Vraja” is another name for Kṛṣṇa. Caitanya recognized Kṛṣṇa as the highest deity and thus reversed the ancient tradition that regarded Kṛṣṇa as but one of the many incarnations of Viṣṇu. For Caitanya, Kṛṣṇa was the fullest and highest manifestation of deity. As Kṛṣṇa is holy, so is the land in which he is believed to have spent his early days, Vṛndāvana. Among all of the worshipers of Kṛṣṇa, Caitanya thought that the way the cowherd women (called *gopī*) of Vraja worshiped him was the best. Theirs was the way of selfless giving of themselves for Kṛṣṇa's pleasure. The most pure of all scriptures is, in Caitanya's view, the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, the Tenth Canto of which tells the story of the life of Kṛṣṇa with special reference to his days in Vṛndāvana. The highest goal of life is not one of the usual goals recognized in the Hindu tradition: wealth (*artha*), sensual enjoyment (*kāma*), religious duty (*dharma*), and liberation (*mokṣa*). For Caitanya it was selfless love (*preman*) for Kṛṣṇa, a condition of emotional life he felt was most purely manifested in the love the cowherd women of Vraja gave to Kṛṣṇa.

---

<sup>48</sup>*Caitanya-mata-mañjuṣā*:

आराध्यो भगवान् ब्रजेशतनयस्तद्धाम वृन्दावनम्  
रम्या काचिदुपासना ब्रजवधूवर्गेण या कल्पिता ।  
शास्त्रं भागवतं प्रमाणममलं प्रेमा पुमर्थो महान्  
श्रीचैतन्यमहाप्रभोर्मतमिदं तत्रादरो नः परः ॥

Thus, Caitanya understood the Vedāntic absolute as a highly attractive and loving, personal god. Considering their radically different views on Vedānta, therefore, Sadānanda might have shaken his head and lamented the straying of such a fine young renunciant from the path of non-dualism. According to Caitanya's hagiographies many of the renunciants of the non-dualist orders did lament his straying from their fold.

Among the many learned men who became followers of Caitanya were the two brothers, Sanātana and Rūpa, and their nephew Jīva. These three men formed the hub of a group of followers who at Caitanya's request settled in Vṛndāvana near the city of Mathurā in the state of Uttar Pradesh, not far from the Moghul seat of power in Agra. There they wrote books, "recovered" the sites of Kṛṣṇa's activities, and developed the methods of worship and meditation that became the standards for the later tradition. The tradition gave them the title of respect, *gosvāmin*, "master of cows" (Kṛṣṇa was after all a cowherding boy in his youth), and looked to their writings and examples for edification and inspiration. Sanātana Gosvāmin focused on theology, ritual, and hermeneutics; Rūpa Gosvāmin on religious aesthetics, poetry and drama; and Jīva Gosvāmin, working with the South Indian follower of Caitanya, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, concentrated on philosophy, hermeneutics, and poetry. Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmin provided the ritual foundations for the worship and practices of the tradition. No one in the group — which, with the addition of Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmin and Raghunātha Dāsa Gosvāmin, is referred to as the Six Gosvāmin of Vṛndāvana — wrote a commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra* (another name for the *Brahma-sūtra*) or anything specifically on Vedānta; however, Vedāntic philosophy pervades their writings. The group produced no formal commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra* because it believed the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* to be written by the same author as the *Vedānta-sūtra* and thought of the *Purāṇa* as the most authoritative commentary (*bhāṣya*) on the *sūtra*. Instead they directed their energy to expounding the philosophy of the *Purāṇa*. Indeed, the *Bhāgavata* begins with the same words as the first teaching *sūtra* of the *Vedānta-sūtra* (*janmādy asya yataḥ* — "that from which this [universe] has its birth, and so forth," B.s., 1.1.2), indicating some intended connection there. This strategy worked well for the first century and a half until the Caitanya tradition came more directly into competition with other traditions and was forced to define itself in more formal terms.

Although the first generation of writers did not produce any dedicated

Vedāntic text, they were able to give the tradition a philosophical and theological identity that distinguished it from the other religious communities of that time. This was accomplished primarily in the work of Jīva Gosvāmin who picked up and completed the efforts of Gopāla Bhaṭṭa Gosvāmin by composing the six theological treatises referred to as the *The Six Treatises* (*Ṣaṭ-sandarbhā*) or collectively as the *Treatises on the Philosophy of Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (*Bhāgavata-sandarbhā*). The Treatises follow a line of thought expressed in a verse from the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (1.2.11):

Knowers of the truth say the [highest] truth, which is non-dual knowledge (*tattva*), is called *Brahman*, *Paramātmān*, and *Bhagavān*.<sup>49</sup>

Here the author of the *Purāṇa* is making the claim that the absolute, which is non-dual consciousness, is described by three distinct names. *Brahman* is the non-dual absolute of the Advaita Vedānta tradition and represents the transcendent absolute. *Paramātmān* or Highest Self is the immanent aspect of deity dwelling within the world and in all living beings as their inner witness as they are born, live, die, and transmigrate from one body to another. *Bhagavān* is the personal form of the deity with whom one may enter a personal, loving relationship. These are three visions of the absolute held by three different types of religious practitioner: the follower of Vedānta, the practitioner of *yoga*, and the devotee of the personal deity. The author of the *Purāṇa* thus tries to integrate all three visions of the absolute into one overarching system by saying that they all refer to the same non-dual truth or principle. That is the process followed and extended by Jīva in the *Treatises*.

The first three of the six treatises derive their names from the verse from the *Purāṇa*. The first is called the *Treatise on the Truth* (*Tattva-sandarbhā*) and is the work in which Jīva discusses Brahman and criticizes the Advaita tradition's efforts to promote this as the only valid representation of absolute truth. The second is the *Treatise on the Personal Lord* (*Bhagavat-sandarbhā*)

---

<sup>49</sup>*Bhāgavata* (1.2.11):

वदन्ति तत्तत्त्वविदस्तत्त्वं यज्ज्ञानमद्वयम् ।  
ब्रह्मेति परमात्मेति भगवानिति शब्दते ॥

and focuses on the nature of Bhagavān, the personal lord in his own nature. The third is the *Treatise on the Highest Self* (*Paramātmā-sandarbhā*) and focuses on Paramātmān as the ground of the living beings (*jīva*) and of the power of that creates the world. The last three treatises adopt another schematic. One should know three things before embarking on a course of study or religious cultivation: the fundamental subject-matter of a discipline (*abhidheya*), the relationship of the student to that subject-matter (*sambandha*), and the purpose of the study or discipline (*prayojana*). Thus, Jīva's fourth treatise, the *Treatise on Kṛṣṇa* (*Kṛṣṇa-sandarbhā*) represents the subject-matter of the tradition's religious discourse: Kṛṣṇa. The fifth, the *Treatise on Devotion* (*Bhakti-sandarbhā*), defines the relationship one has (or should have) with the subject-matter: devotion or *bhakti*. The sixth, the *Treatise on Love* (*Prīti-sandarbhā*), describes the final purpose or goal of the endeavor: divine love (*preman* or *prīti*). In his auto-commentary on the second of the six *Treatises*, called *All-Conversant* (*Sarva-saṃvādinī*), Jīva provides the Caitanya tradition with an orientation that pushes the tendency towards integration, initiated by the author of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, to its logical completion.

He defined the fundamental position of the Caitanya tradition as *acintya-bhedābheda-tattva*, the principle (*tattva*) of inconceivable (*acintya*) difference (*bheda*) and non-difference (*abheda*). He said that there exists a relationship between the deity and the world and its living beings of both difference and non-difference, and this relationship is ultimately beyond human ability to comprehend. With this principle Jīva has accepted those Vedāntic schools that have taught non-difference or non-dualism in various ways and at the same time he has accepted those Vedāntic schools that have taught difference or dualism in various forms. His acceptance of the validity of both camps has led to the assertion of inconceivability. If one side were considered invalid then the other would have to be accepted as valid. To accept both mutually contradictory assertions as true is to suggest that reality is beyond our ability to understand. If he faults any of the other Vedāntic schools, it is because they have not gone far enough. They have settled with only part of the truth and taken that one part for the whole truth.

Surprisingly enough, the principle of inconceivable difference and non-difference is not based on a passage or verse from the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, but comes from a commentary by a Vaiṣṇava teacher named Śrīdhara Svāmin

on a verse from the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (1.3.2). This verse answers the question: how does the pure, unknowable, quality-less Brahman become the agent of creation? The response is:

Just as the powers of all things are beyond the scope of conceivable knowledge, so are the powers of Brahman, which are the sources of creation and so forth. O best of ascetics, they are like the power of heat belonging to fire.<sup>50</sup>

Śrīdhara in his commentary on this verse defines “inconceivable” as being unable to think of something in terms of difference or non-difference. For Śrīdhara the powers of Brahman are inconceivable in this sense, but they are knowable through the source of knowledge called postulation (*arthāpatti*). Postulation is a kind of reasoning exemplified by this example: “Devadatta does not eat during the day, yet Devadatta is fat. Therefore, he must eat at night.” When applied to the situation of Brahman and the creation of the world, the reasoning would go something like this: “Brahman is pure and without material qualities, yet there has been a creation of the world. Therefore, Brahman must have powers that bring about the creation of the world, like the fire’s power to generate heat.” Jīva builds on these ideas and argues in his commentary on the *Treatise on the Personal Lord* (para 16):

Therefore, because of being unable to think of it (power) as not different from his own nature, difference is perceived; and because of being unable to think of it as different from his own nature, non-difference is perceived. Therefore, the difference *and* non-difference of the power and the possessor of the power are accepted and those are unthinkable.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>50</sup> *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (1.3.2):

शक्तयः सर्वभावानामचिन्त्यज्ञानगोचराः  
यतोऽतो ब्रह्मणस्तास्तु सर्गाद्या भावशक्तयः ।  
भवन्ति तपतां श्रेष्ठ पावकस्य यथोष्णता ॥

Quoted in Jīva’s *Treatise on the Personal Lord*, para. 16 (Śāstrī) or pp. 30-31 (Chatterjee).

<sup>51</sup> *Treatise on the Personal Lord* (para 16): तस्माद् स्वरूपादभिन्नत्वेन चिन्तयितुमशक्यत्वाद्भेदः, भिन्नत्वेन चिन्तयितुमशक्यत्वादभेदश्च प्रतीयत इति शक्तिशक्तिमतोर्भेदाभेदावेवाङ्गीकृतौ तौ चाचिन्त्याविति, Jīva’s *Sarva-saṃvādinī*, (Chatterjee), pp. 36-37

The power and the possessor of power, then, become the fundamental categories of the Caitanya tradition. The possessor of power is Kṛṣṇa and the power is everyone and everything else. The relationship between those categories is one of inconceivable difference and non-difference.

Inconceivable difference and non-difference became the private or internal understanding of the nature of reality for the Caitanya tradition, buried as it was in a footnote on a text generally read only by a few members of the tradition. This was all that was needed for the tradition for a century and a half, however. Only after it faced a challenge from outside did it have to take a public stance. That challenge came from a tradition called the Rāmānandī sect which found itself in competition with the Caitanya tradition for the support of a king of Rajasthan, Mahārāja Jayasimha Sawai II (18th cent.). By then the first generation of theologians were long gone. The tradition turned instead to a young scholar named Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa to defend it. In order to do that, Baladeva had to compose a full commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*, which he named the *Govinda-bhāṣya* after Govinda, one of the major images of Kṛṣṇa worshiped in the tradition; and it is said that he wrote it in less than a month.<sup>52</sup> That same Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa is the author of the second text translated here, *The Necklace of Truth-Jewels*.

## Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa

Not much is known about Baladeva's early life. Several accounts<sup>53</sup> say that he was born in a *vaiśya*<sup>54</sup> family in a village called Remuna now in the Balasor subdivision of Orissa. Although his caste was not high, they report, he demonstrated himself to be an uncommonly gifted student and continued his studies in grammar, literary criticism, logic, Vedic studies, and

<sup>52</sup>Baladeva says in one of his other works, the *Siddhānta-ratna* (8.31), that the deity Govinda instructed him in a dream to write the commentary.

<sup>53</sup>Sudesh Narang in *The Vaiṣṇava Philosophy according to Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa* (Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1984), pp. 1-2. Michael Wright and Nancy Wright, "Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa: the Gauḍīya Vedāntist" in the *Journal of Vaiṣṇava Studies*, Vol.1, No. 2 (Winter 1993), pp. 158-184. Bhaktivedanta Vaman Swami in his Bengali introduction to the *Siddhānta-ratnam* (Navadvīpa: Śrī Gauḍīya Vedānta Samiti, 1973), pp. v-vii.

<sup>54</sup>The *vaiśya* caste or *varṇa* is the third caste and is usually made up of agriculturalists, merchants, and artisans.

Vedānta. At an early age he is supposed to have become a follower of the Mādhva tradition, a Vaiṣṇava tradition founded by the saint Madhva in South India in the 13th cent. C.E., and to have traveled to Mysore to study the Mādhva texts and commentaries. He later returned to his own state of Orissa and settled in the temple town of Jagannath Puri. There he met and had discussions with Rādhādāmodara, a brāhmaṇa from Kanyakubja who was a follower of the Caitanya tradition. He became attracted to the tradition and eventually became Rādhādāmodara's disciple. As a result he left Puri and went to Vṛndāvana where he studied the texts of the Caitanya tradition with the great scholar and commentator Viśvanātha Cakravartin and another scholar named Pītāmbara Dāsa.

There are two problems with this account of his life. First, there is little agreement about his dates. The Library of Congress has set his dates, for unknown reasons, at 1720 to 1790 CE. Another scholar, Stuart Elkman, places his birth around 1700.<sup>55</sup> If the disputation with the Rāmānandīs in the court of Mahārāja Jayasiṃha took place in 1704 as Gopinath Kaviraj claims,<sup>56</sup> he would have been too young to attend and defend the Caitanya tradition. His last work, a commentary on Rūpa Gosvāmin's collection of hymns called the *Garland of Prayers (Stava-mālā)*, is dated 1764. If he died shortly after that, it is not too unlikely to put his birth date at around 1680. This would make him a young man in his twenties during the disputation in Jaipur. It seems reasonable, then, to place Baladeva's life between 1680 and 1765 CE.

The second problem is more intriguing, however. Considering the social and religious climate at the time, it is hard to believe that Baladeva would have been able to achieve all that he appears to without being born a brāhmaṇa. It is unlikely that he would have been accepted into the Mādhva community and taught Vedānta unless he were a member of the highest caste. Members were accepted into that tradition from all of the castes, but they were not allowed to study the Veda and Vedānta unless they were brāhmaṇa. Even in the more liberal Caitanya tradition to which he converted, one can see a distinction among its teachers. Those

<sup>55</sup>Stuart Elkman in *Jīva Gosvāmin's Tattva-sandarbhā* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986), p. 25.

<sup>56</sup>Gopinath Kaviraj, introduction to his edition of Baladeva's *Siddhānta-ratnam* (Varanasi: The Princess of Wales, Saraswati Bhavana Series, 1924 and 1927), Part II, p. 4.



who were *brāhmaṇa* could write and teach in any field, but those who were not wrote only literary works or literary criticism. For instance, those who wrote wrote on philosophy (topics dealing with the interpretation of the Upaniṣads, the *Vedānta-sūtra*, the *Bhagavad-gītā* and the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*) and ritual were invariably *brāhmaṇa* (Sanātana, Rūpa, Jīva, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, and Viśvanātha Cakravartin). Sometimes, indeed, *brāhmaṇa* also wrote literary works and literary criticism (Rūpa, Jīva, and Viśvanātha, for example). Nevertheless, those who were not *brāhmaṇa* never wrote on philosophy or ritual. Murāri Gupta, Raghunātha Dāsa, Kavikarṇapūra, and Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, for instance, wrote only poems, plays, biographies, hymns, and texts on literary criticism. When this distinction appears even within the Caitanya tradition, it is hard to imagine the leaders of the tradition sending a *vaiśya* to an assembly of conservative *brāhmaṇa* to dispute over philosophical interpretations. It is also hard to imagine a non-*brāhmaṇa* being accepted into an already hostile assembly as a credible representative of the Caitanya tradition.

The idea that Baladeva was a *vaiśya* can be traced to the writings of some influential leaders of the Caitanya tradition at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries — Ṭhākura Bhaktivinoda and one of his sons, Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī.<sup>57</sup> What evidence he had for the claim is not known. He was at one point a district magistrate in Orissa and perhaps he found evidence of Baladeva's roots during his tenure there.

There might be another reason, however, for Bhaktivinoda's claim. He was himself a *vaiśya* by caste and if Baladeva could be proven to be an example of a *vaiśya* or simply a non-*brāhmaṇa* who rose to the respected position of Vedāntācārya, Preceptor of Vedānta, then Bhaktivinoda himself would be more likely to be accepted as an authoritative teacher and theologian by the more conservative members of the Caitanya tradition. Perhaps he was trying to overcome the unspoken tendency noted previously of reserving the philosophical and ritual discussions for *brāhmaṇa* members of the tradition. In the hands of his son, Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī,

---

<sup>57</sup>Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura, "Gauḍīya Vedāntācārya Śrīla Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa," in *Śrī Gauḍīya Patrikā*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 127-130. Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī, "Bhāṣyakārera Vivaraṇa," his introduction to his edition of the *Bhagavad-gītā* (Calcutta: Gauḍīya Maṭha, 3rd ed., n.d.) with Baladeva's commentary. Bhaktiprajñāna Keśava, "Gauḍīya Vedāntācārya Baladeva," in *Śrī Gauḍīya Patrikā*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 10-17. Bhaktiprajñāna Keśava was a disciple of Bhaktisiddhānta.

Baladeva's supposed non-*brāhmaṇa* origins became a weapon in a struggle against *brāhmaṇa* in general and the caste Goswami in particular whose claim to sanctity by birth he strongly challenged. For Bhaktisiddhānta, one was a *brāhmaṇa* not by birth, but by occupation.<sup>58</sup>

Akṣaya Kumāra Śarmā, editor of the edition of Baladeva's *Prameya-ratnāvalī* primarily used for this translation, criticizes the view that Baladeva was a *vaiśya*.<sup>59</sup> Śarmā cites some unnamed person's view, possibly Bhaktisiddhānta's, that Baladeva was born in a *vaiśya* family and after being initiated by a Vaiṣṇava *brāhmaṇa* became a *brāhmaṇa*. Moreover, says this person, those who know the scriptures know that *brāhmaṇa* by birth are produced from *brāhmaṇa* by profession. Śarmā's response is that typical of a conservative *brāhmaṇa*. Such claims, he says, are to be rejected as the ravings of a mad man. No one is able to change to another caste in their current birth even with the greatest of austerities. Wherever there is the appearance of such a statement in the scriptures, it is to be understood as merely glorification of austerity (*tapas*). Citing some of the Hindu law texts, he says that no one is able to become a *brāhmaṇa* by assuming the occupation of one. One becomes a *brāhmaṇa* by birth. Śarmā goes on to say that he has never heard of anyone who was not a *brāhmaṇa* receiving the honorific title of "preceptor" (*ācārya*).

More germane to our purposes, however, Śarmā points to indications in Baladeva's own writings that he was born a *brāhmaṇa*. In his auto-commentary on the second verse of his *Jewel of Conclusion* (*Siddhānta-ratna*) Baladeva refers to the Murāri mentioned in the verse as his own fourth ancestor (*svapūrva-caturtha*), Rasikānanda Murāri. Rasikānanda Murāri is indisputably known to have been a *brāhmaṇa* and it thus follows that Baladeva, his descendant, was one too. One might object that Murāri was not Baladeva's biological ancestor, but the guru who was the fourth in the disciplic succession before him. Śarmā responds by saying that to praise one's fourth prior guru without mentioning one's immediate guru is contrary to proper Vaiṣṇava etiquette. More telling still, Śarmā notes, is the fact that Baladeva says in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra* (1.3.36) that

<sup>58</sup>The six occupations of the *brāhmaṇa* are described in the law texts (*Manu-saṃhitā*, 1.88): studying, teaching, sacrificing for himself and for others, giving and receiving alms.

<sup>59</sup>Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, *Prameya-ratnāvalī*, edited, with his own commentary and the *Kānti-mālā* of Vedānta-vāgīśa, by Akṣaya Kumāra Śarmā Śāstrī (Calcutta: Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat, 1927), pp. x-xii.

only *brāhmaṇa* are qualified to deal with knowledge of the Veda, which includes the Upaniṣads and thus Vedānta, too. Śarmā asks how Baladeva could say such a thing and then, while being a *vaiśya*, accept the position of Preceptor of Vedānta. It appears, Śarmā concludes, that Baladeva was not a *vaiśya*, but a *brāhmaṇa*. One should note that Śarmā's own attitude toward non-*brāhmaṇa* in Vedic studies is itself indicative of the kind of opposition Baladeva would have faced had he not been a *brāhmaṇa*.

Baladeva, therefore, is not likely to be an example of someone who has crossed the great divide between the domain of the other castes and the domain of the *brāhmaṇa*, as appealing as that would be to our modern western sensibilities. The social realities of his times cannot be ignored in favor of some fantasy about equal opportunity for all. This may throw something of a damp towel on the political and reform aspirations of some members of the Caitanya tradition, but it does not lessen Baladeva's position as one of the tradition's great thinkers, perhaps even its last great thinker.

## The Necklace of Truth-Jewels

The *Necklace of Truth-Jewels* (*Prameya-ratnāvalī*) is the standard philosophical introduction to the Caitanya tradition. As such it is comparable to the *Vedānta-sāra* which stands as the introductory text of the Advaita tradition. The *Necklace* gives briefly the accepted truths of the tradition along with scriptural evidence for those truths in the form of numerous quotations. By "truths" is meant that which can be proven or known for certain (*prameya*). As with the *Sāra* not much attention is given to the means of certain knowledge (*pramāṇa*). As the student of the Advaita Vedānta must turn to the *Explanation of Vedānta* (*Vedānta-paribhāṣā*) for a detailed discussion of the means of knowing, so the student of the Caitanya tradition must turn to the *Wish-fulfilling Gem of Vedānta* (*Vedānta-syamantaka*) by Baladeva's teacher Rādhādāmodara<sup>60</sup> for an account of the means of

<sup>60</sup>Some argue that the *Vedānta-syamantaka* was written by Baladeva himself. The work's penultimate verse is one that Baladeva uses in his *Necklace* and in other works. The final verse, which appears to be a signature verse referring to Rādhādāmodara, might be interpreted as referring to a *brāhmaṇa* (Baladeva) who cherishes the names of Rādhā-Dāmodara.

knowing and of the five fundamental principles of Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism (God, living beings, nature, time, and action). The use of the metaphor of a necklace of beautiful jewels in the title is more than just an attractive image here. It indicates that the author intended the text to be memorized or “held at the throat” (*kaṇṭha-stha*). Baladeva’s work is entirely versified making its commitment to memory much easier. In this way it differs somewhat from the *Sāra* which is a prose work not meant to be memorized (though it was anyway).

In the *Necklace*, Baladeva asserts a strong connection between the Caitanya tradition and the earlier Vaiṣṇava tradition coming from the great Vaiṣṇava saint and teacher Madhva. He presents a list of the names of all the teachers, beginning with Kṛṣṇa, passing through Madhva, and ending with Caitanya, who have transmitted the teachings of the tradition. There are plenty of reasons to doubt the validity of this lineage, however, not the least of which are the numerous differences between the teachings and practices of the Mādhva and the Caitanya traditions. As Vaiṣṇava traditions, that is, as religious traditions focusing on the worship of Viṣṇu, they naturally have much in common, but can they really be said to be part of the same community and tradition?

Of the five teachings in Śrīnātha’s verse that are said to be the core of Caitanya’s belief, the followers of Madhva at best would accept only three: that Kṛṣṇa is to be worshipped, that his abode is Vṛndāvana, and that the *Bhāgavata* is the pure source of truth. Kṛṣṇa, however, is not considered the highest or most complete manifestation of deity in the Mādhva community, nor is his home Vṛndāvana thought to be the supreme abode. Kṛṣṇa is but one of the many faces of Viṣṇu whose home is called Vaikuṇṭha. The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, while accepted as an authoritative scripture, is not the only “pure” source of truth for the Mādhva tradition. More importantly, the Mādhva tradition does not accept the manner of worship of the cowherd women as the best, and divine love (*preman*) like theirs as the ultimate issue of *bhakti*.

The Mādhva tradition and the Caitanya tradition differ fundamentally in their estimation of the relationship that exists between deity and world, deity and living being. For the Mādhva follower these things are always distinct or different (*bhinna*) principles (*tattva*), though the world and the

living beings are regarded as thoroughly dependent on deity.<sup>61</sup> They are thus not independent and without any form of relationship. Still, any suggestion that they are in any way non-different is rejected. As we saw, in the Caitanya tradition an inconceivable difference and non-difference is posited between deity and world, deity and living being. This is because, in the Caitanya tradition, the fundamental relationship posited between them is that between the possessor of power (deity) and the power (world and living being). The Mādhva tradition sees the relationship between power and its possessor as non-difference that appears like difference. For them, this is accomplished through a technical understanding of the concept of the differentiator (*viśeṣa*) which causes the appearance of difference when in fact there is no difference. This is something like the Caitanya tradition's inconceivable difference and non-difference. However, the Mādhva tradition does not see the world or the living being as powers of Kṛṣṇa as the Caitanya tradition does. Thus the relationship of *viśeṣa* does not hold between deity and world or between deity and living being. It only holds between deity and its traits and powers or between living being and its traits and powers. The relationship that the Mādhva tradition sees between deity and world is like that of an original to its reflection (*bimba-pratibimba-bhāva*). As the reflection is completely dependent, in its existence, knowability, and activity, on the thing it is a reflection of, so the world and the living beings are completely dependent on deity.<sup>62</sup>

Quite surprisingly, Baladeva in his *Necklace* and in his other works does not mention the inconceivable difference and non-difference which Jīva's tradition accepted. Instead he mentions the differentiator and describes it in just the way the Mādhva tradition does, as pertaining to the relationship between an entity and its qualities and powers. Assuming Baladeva believed that Kṛṣṇa possesses three powers: the internal, the liminal, and the external, he replaces the idea of there being an inconceivable difference and non-difference between them with the idea of their being the differentiators of Kṛṣṇa. The ideas are very close, but different. Certainly Baladeva knew of the idea of inconceivable difference and non-difference from his study of Jīva's works, but he chose not to propose it and instead stayed

<sup>61</sup>This position is nicely stated in this way in the Mādhva tradition: स्वतन्त्रं परतन्त्रञ्च द्विविधं तत्त्वमिष्यते, "Two types of truth are affirmed: independent and dependent."

<sup>62</sup>See B. N. K. Sharma, *The Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, rev. ed., 1986), p. 28.

close to the Mādhva position. One can only speculate about why Baladeva took the route he did. One interpreter, Mahanamabrata Brahmācari, suggests that Baladeva was not happy with Jīva's appeal to inconceivability and preferred not to give up on logic. He, thus, implemented the idea of differentiators, which even before its use in the Mādhva tradition was a recognized category in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika (Logic-Atomism) school of philosophy.<sup>63</sup> Or, perhaps in creating the public face of the Caitanya tradition he thought it wisest to stick to the by then well established and well argued position of Madhva. To argue the position of Jīva would have been much more difficult, more time consuming, and much more risky. A whole new edifice of argumentation and evidence would have had to be constructed and in the end it may well have been rejected anyway, simply for its novelty.

One of the leading authorities on the Mādhva tradition, B. N. K. Sharma, has discussed the possible connection between the Caitanya and Mādhva traditions in his *History of the Dvaita School of Vedānta and its Literature*. He points out the discrepancies in the guru lineage given by Baladeva and others that supposedly relates Caitanya to Madhva. While not ruling out the possibility, Sharma gives the impression that a transmission of teaching and *mantra* through a disciplic lineage from Madhva to Caitanya was unlikely.<sup>64</sup> On the other hand, Sharma has demonstrated that, whether there was any formal connection or not, the early theologians of the Caitanya tradition, especially Rūpa and Jīva, are much indebted to the writings of Madhva.<sup>65</sup> Whether or not there is any real relationship between the Caitanya tradition and the Mādhva tradition, there is no doubt that the Mādhva tradition exerted a strong influence on certain important members of the Caitanya tradition and probably on no one more strongly

<sup>63</sup>Mahanamabrata Brahmācari, *Vaiṣṇava Vedānta* (Calcutta: Das Gupta & Co., 1974), p. 85.

<sup>64</sup>Sharma, B. N. K., *History of the Dvaita School of Vedānta and its Literature* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, [3rd ed.] 2000), pp. 524-26. Instead, Sharma suggests the possibility that a saint-writer by the name of Viṣṇu Purī, author of a classic text of devotion to Viṣṇu, the *Viṣṇu-bhakti-ratnāvalī* (Necklace of Devotion to Viṣṇu), was the initiator of the devotional movement in North India. The Caitanya tradition may have received it from him through Mādhavendra Purī and Mādhavendra's disciple, Īśvara Purī, who was Caitanya's guru. This indeed would explain the title "Purī" in Caitanya's predecessors which is not a title found in the Mādhva tradition. Mādhva renunciants are called "Tīrtha."

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., p. 527-28.

than on Baladeva. This is evident in his taking as the organizing principle for his *Necklace of Truth-Jewels* the nine truths (*prameya*) of the teachings of Madhva.

It is worth noting here, however, that there is another work that may have been Baladeva's model for his *Necklace*. The work is the *Nine Jewels* (*Nava-ratna*) by Harirāma Vyāsa.<sup>66</sup> Harirāma was born in 1489 C.E. in a village called Undachā in the district of Bundel, according to Haridāsa Śāstrī, the editor of the text. Harirāma was a disciple of someone named Mādhava, a disciple of Īśvara Purī who was also the guru of Caitanya. He thus had a close relationship with the Caitanya tradition although he was not a follower of Caitanya and does not mention him anywhere in his work. He does cite the same lineage of teachers that Baladeva gives in the *Necklace* except that after Īśvara Purī he lists Mādhava and then himself. This text may then be the source of the lineage linking the Caitanya tradition with the Mādhva tradition. This text too takes as its organizing principle the nine truth-jewels taught by Madhva and appeals to many of the same citations from scripture in support of them. The major difference between them is that Baladeva's text is longer. Otherwise they cover much of the same territory.

### Synopsis of the *Necklace*

Baladeva begins his *Necklace* with a verse in praise of Govinda, Gopīnātha, and Madanagopāla, the three main images of Kṛṣṇa in the Caitanya tradition. This verse is part of the auspicious performance (*maṅgalācaraṇa*) like the one we saw before at the beginning of the *Vedānta-sāra*. Apart from the fact that such acts of worship and praise, executed in verse, are believed to remove obstacles to the composition of the work and bring about its successful completion, such opening verses reveal something of the minds and hearts of the authors of the texts. In Baladeva's case, the first verse proclaims his close relationship with the deity Govinda, an image of Kṛṣṇa, who was apparently an inexhaustible source of inspiration for him.<sup>67</sup> Baladeva's next verse praises Caitanya and his two close asso-

<sup>66</sup>Published with the *Prameya-ratnāvalī* edited by Haridāsa Śāstrī (Kālīdaha, Vṛndāvana: Sadgranthaprakāśaka, 1981), pp. 72-100.

<sup>67</sup>Baladeva says in his *Siddhānta-ratna* (8.31) that Govinda appeared to him in a dream and asked him to compose the commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra* for which he is famous.

ciates, Advaita and Nityānanda, who are seen as three faces of the same ultimate truth. By double-entendre, he praises the absolute truth in a way consistent with the general Vedāntic vision of reality. Next Baladeva offers praise of Ānandatīrtha, another name for Madhvācārya, who he says is like a boat for crossing the ocean of existential redundancy. Finally, he praises the chain of teachers, the succession of teachers and disciples who have transmitted the teachings of the tradition from age to age. These first four verses constitute the auspicious performance for this work, then.

Baladeva next pauses to emphasize the importance of the succession of teachers, and presents what he believes to be his own succession coming down from Kṛṣṇa through Madhva to Caitanya. This provides a justification for Baladeva's acceptance of the nine truth-jewels taught by Madhva as compatible with the teachings of the Caitanya tradition. In fact, Baladeva places Caitanya's teaching as a frame around the teachings of Madhva. According to Baladeva:

The moonlike Kṛṣṇacaitanya who is Hari himself, teaches thus: Madhva said: Viṣṇu is the highest (1) and is known by all sacred traditions (2), the world is real (3) and so is difference (4), living beings are the servants of Hari [Viṣṇu] (5), there is a hierarchy among them (6), liberation is attaining the feet of Viṣṇu (7), untainted worship of him is its cause (8), and the sources of knowledge are the triad headed by perception (9).<sup>68</sup>

The rest of the text is devoted to unpacking and then supporting these nine teachings with quotations from the Vedāntic proof texts and argumentation. The remainder of the first chapter is devoted to discussion of the first of the truths, that Viṣṇu is the highest deity.

In discussing the supremacy of Viṣṇu, Baladeva first replaces Viṣṇu with Kṛṣṇa, a change that is meaningful to the Caitanya tradition, since

<sup>68</sup>*Prameya-ratnāvalī*, 1.5:

श्रीमध्वः प्राह विष्णुं परतममखिलाम्नायवेद्यञ्च विश्वं  
सत्यं भेदञ्च जीवान् हरिचरणजुषस्तारतम्यञ्च तेषाम् ।  
मोक्षं विष्णवद्विलाभं तदमलभजनं तस्य हेतुं प्रमाणं  
प्रत्यक्षादित्रयञ्चेत्युपदिशति हरिः कृष्णचैतन्यचन्द्रः ॥



Kṛṣṇa in that tradition is considered the fullest expression of deity. To the Mādhva tradition Viṣṇu and Kṛṣṇa are the same. Though theologically there is no difference between Viṣṇu and Kṛṣṇa, the Caitanya tradition prefers Kṛṣṇa because he provides a better object for the experience of *bhakti-rasa* or sacred rapture. Kṛṣṇa is the highest deity because he is the cause of all, the bearer of qualities like omnipresence, consciousness, joy, and so forth, and has the eternal goddess as his mate (1.6). If one wonders how consciousness and joy can be understood as having form, the example Baladeva gives is that of a musical scale called a *rāga* in Indian music (1.8a). Just as to the trained connoisseur the different *rāga* are perceived as having forms, so for one whose mind is suffused with *bhakti*, Kṛṣṇa too is perceived as having form. Moreover, unlike an ordinary living being, there is no difference between Kṛṣṇa's body (his form) and his self (1.8c) and, though situated far away in his own divine abode, he pervades everything and is simultaneously present before all those meditating on him (1.9).

Kṛṣṇa has unlimited power, which is referred to as *aiśvarya-yoga* in the *Bhagavad-gītā* (at 9.5, for instance). That power is capable of accomplishing even the most impossible of tasks, and between himself and his characteristics and powers there is only the appearance of difference, not real difference (1.11). Here is where Baladeva borrows the concept of *viśeṣa* (differentiating trait) from the Mādhva tradition to account for the relationship between Kṛṣṇa and his qualities and powers. As mentioned before, *viśeṣa* is a relationship of non-difference that appears as difference.<sup>69</sup> An example is found in the statement: "time always is," in which the quality of having time ("always") is attributed to time itself. There appears to be a difference between the quality of time and time itself, but there is really no difference. Baladeva turns next to the idea that Viṣṇu (Kṛṣṇa) has three powers and the one known as the "higher" power is the goddess Śrī. She is not different from Viṣṇu (1.12), according to Baladeva. This, he says, was taught by Caitanya to his disciples. The other two powers are the "lower" and the "knower of the field." The lower power is *māyā*, the power that creates the universe or the "field," and the other, the knower of the field, is the living being, who knows a small part of the field, that part associated with its body and mind. Of these it would seem, from Baladeva's explicit

<sup>69</sup>His commentator, Vedāntavāgīśa, gives the following definition of *viśeṣa*: विशेषश्च भेदप्रतिनिधिर्न भेदः "*Viśeṣa* is the surrogate of difference, not difference."

statement, that only the goddess is non-different from Viṣṇu and that the other two powers should be understood as different from, but dependent on Kṛṣṇa.

Baladeva goes on to say that even though Viṣṇu is one and Lakṣmī (Śrī) is one, they appear as many in many different, self-assumed forms (1.13). Moreover, although their completeness in those many forms is indistinguishable, there is, among all those forms, a hierarchy based on their relative manifestation of power (1.14). Thus it is that Kṛṣṇa is understood as greater than Viṣṇu. Nevertheless, because they are all one, their fullness as deity is part of their very nature (1.15). When Kṛṣṇa appears in the manifest world, he first causes his home, which is also a part of him, to appear here and then he appears in it. Baladeva says that just as fools attribute ordinary human nature to Govinda (another name of Kṛṣṇa) who is eternal being, consciousness, and joy, so do they think of his home as ordinary (1.16-7). His action, too, is eternal because of his unlimited forms, unlimited companions, and unlimited homes, and because his action is not different from him. With this comment Baladeva ends the first chapter of the *Necklace*. By this final comment he means to say that Kṛṣṇa's action is unlike the action of an ordinary person which has a beginning, a middle, and an end. Kṛṣṇa's action has no beginning, no middle, and no end because of his unlimited forms, in which he is always acting, his unlimited companions with whom he is always acting, and his unlimited homes in which he is always acting. Each action or *līlā* (sport)<sup>70</sup> is always being performed somewhere.

The second chapter of the *Necklace* is on Kṛṣṇa's being the subject of all sacred texts. Baladeva says that all the Veda sing of Mādhava (another name of Kṛṣṇa) either directly or indirectly; the Upaniṣads do so directly and the rest indirectly (2.1). He adds that the statements about the indescribability of the absolute that are occasionally seen in the Veda only mean that it cannot be described completely, otherwise even to begin such a description, as the Veda obviously do, would be useless (2.2). Moreover, it is not to be said that Brahman is without character and therefore is indescribable because of not being classifiable by universals and so forth which are the reasons for the use of words. If Brahman were incapable of description by any words, then even indirect signification (*lakṣaṇā*) would not be

<sup>70</sup>Kṛṣṇa's actions are regarded as sport or play because they are free and spontaneous, not dictated by some necessity.

possible. A Brahman without characteristics cannot be described even indirectly. Here Baladeva is critiquing the Advaita Vedānta tradition's use of indirect signification to interpret the great pronouncement: "that you are" (*tattvamasi*).<sup>71</sup>

In the third chapter Baladeva seeks to establish the reality of the universe. This directly contradicts the Advaita position which is that the universe is unreal, a projection of the power of ignorance. Baladeva says that the omniscient Viṣṇu creates the universe with his own power and thus it is real. Statements of the world's unreality found in the Veda are only meant to bring about detachment from it (3.1). In statements like "this was only the Self in the beginning" (*Aitareya U.*, 1.1), the universe is still to be regarded as real, real like a bird that has blended into the forest. As a bird continues to exist though it cannot be distinguished from the forest that surrounds it, so the universe exists in a subtle form in the Self before its creation.

The fourth chapter is devoted to drawing a clear distinction between Viṣṇu and the living beings (*jīva*). Baladeva appeals to the same six measures of the import of a text or passage of a text that the Advaitin does, namely: opening, closing, repetition, novelty, result, glorification, and justification (4.1).<sup>72</sup> In Baladeva's case, however, they establish difference, not non-difference as the Advaitin says they do. In the statements of the Veda, he adds, difference is found to apply even in the state of liberation. Therefore, difference is absolute. Statements of the Advaitin like "I am Brahman; I am the only living being; there are no other living beings, nor a god; and they are all imagined through my ignorance" are thus belied. Otherwise the meaning of revealed texts like "the one eternal ..." and so forth are not adequately accounted for (4.2-3). Baladeva is referring here to a famous passage in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*: "the one eternal among the many eternal, ..." (*Kaṭha U.*, 2.2.13) where it is stated that the living beings are plural and eternal. From the one eternal and conscious Lord the many eternal and conscious living beings are distinct. Therefore, difference is eternal (4.4). Baladeva adds that just as the power of speech and other expressions of life are identified with the life force because they operate under the control

---

<sup>71</sup>See the synopsis of the *Vedānta-sāra* earlier in this introduction and the translation, paras. 116-122.

<sup>72</sup>See the translation of the *Vedānta-sāra*, para. 130.

of the life force, so the living beings are identified with Brahman because they operate under the control of Brahman (4.5).

Others think the universe is Brahman because it is pervaded by Brahman (4.6). Still others accept the position that living beings are reflected Brahman or delimited Brahman. Such positions are overturned by the wise who point out that according to those same parties Brahman is not an object, and thus cannot be reflected, and is all-pervading, and thus cannot be delimited (4.7). Here Baladeva has in mind the two major divisions of the Advaita tradition. These are represented in the *Vedānta-sāra* by the examples of the reservoir (Brahman is reflected like the sky in a reservoir) and of the forest (Brahman is delimited like space circumscribed by the boundaries of a forest).<sup>73</sup> Baladeva next asks the Advaitin, “Is the non-duality of Brahman different from Brahman or not different from it?” In the first case one is faced with dualism and in the second case one is wasting time establishing what is already established (4.8). In either case the Advaitin is in trouble in Baladeva’s view. The wise should not believe in a false, quality-less Brahman, says Baladeva, because it is not subject to any of the sources of knowledge (4.9). Thus, Baladeva dismisses the conception of Brahman held by the followers of Advaita Vedānta.

The fifth chapter is very short and in it Baladeva simply gives scriptural citations that support the idea that the living beings are properly, or by nature, servants of Hari.

In the sixth chapter Baladeva takes up the question of whether there is a hierarchy among living beings. He says that though living beings are the same in terms of their inherent qualities like minuteness, consciousness, possession of knowledge, and so forth, they form a hierarchy based on their practices (6.1). Even in the world around us, living beings, though by nature equal, fall into an inequality due to their different actions (*karman*). The experts say that there is an inequality after liberation because of different types of *bhakti* (6.2). There are five emotional configurations associated with *bhakti*, beginning with tranquility and extending up to erotic attraction.<sup>74</sup> Here Baladeva is following his predecessor, Rūpa Gosvāmin

<sup>73</sup>See the trans. of the *Vedānta-sāra*, para. 36 and following.

<sup>74</sup>These five emotional configurations or relationships are tranquility (*śānti*), servitude (*dāsya*), friendship (*sakhya*), parental love (*vātsalya*), and erotic love (*madhura-rati*). While all are good, the later ones are considered better than the former ones in Baladeva’s tra-

who systematized the *bhakti* experience into five main varieties almost two centuries earlier.<sup>75</sup>

Baladeva in the seventh chapter advances the idea that liberation means attainment of the company of Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa, the Lord himself, appears in many forms. Those desiring him who are liberated reside happily with him in his eternal world (7.1). In the eighth chapter Baladeva answers the question: “how does one achieve such a liberation?” It is achieved by single-minded *bhakti* to Kṛṣṇa. *Bhakti* means cultivating a relationship with Kṛṣṇa. It also refers to the emotional impact of that relationship once cultivated. If one serves saintly people and one’s guru as if they were the Lord himself, one attains *bhakti* to the Lord (8.1). Having received the five consecrations (*saṁskāra*) and one of the two types of *bhakti*, one has direct experience of Hari and thereafter enjoys residing eternally in his abode (8.2). Baladeva describes in the rest of the eighth chapter the practical elements of *bhakti*: the five consecrations, the nine sub-divisions, various related practices, and the things to be avoided in the practice of *bhakti*.

The first of the consecrations is branding which means being physically branded with the symbols of Viṣṇu. Baladeva’s commentator Kṛṣṇadeva remarks that, according to Caitanya, in the current age one can make those marks and the syllables of the names of Hari with sandalwood paste instead of by branding. The second consecration is the upward mark which means the mark on the forehead that distinguishes Vaiṣṇava traditions from each other and from other types of religious communities. Among the Vaiṣṇava, the mark is believed to represent the temple of Hari or the mark of his footprint. The third consecration is a new name that is given to newly initiated members of the tradition. The names are always names that mean “servant of Hari (Haridāsa or Kṛṣṇadāsa, etc.).” The fourth consecration is receiving the *mantra*, or sacred formula, like the ten or the eighteen syllable Gopāla *mantra*,<sup>76</sup> which is recited regularly by the devotee. The *mantra* is said to be the very body of the chosen deity. It is received

dition because they are more intimate.

<sup>75</sup>See Rūpa’s *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu*, Second Division, Chapter Five.

<sup>76</sup>The ten syllable mantra is: क्लीं गोपीजनवल्लभाय स्वाहा. The eighteen syllable mantra is: क्लीं कृष्णाय गोविन्दाय गोपीजनवल्लभाय स्वाहा. These *mantra* consist of Kṛṣṇa’s names in the Sanskrit case ending indicating him as the receiver of offerings. Its proper context, then, is one of worship in which offerings are made to him as in worship involving consecrated images (*pūjā*).

as part of an initiation ceremony from the guru. The final consecration is worship as exemplified in ritual worship of the Śālagrāma stones (stones with fossil markings found in certain rivers in India and Nepal, believed to be forms of Viṣṇu) and in ritualized worship of consecrated images of Viṣṇu or Kṛṣṇa (8.4).

*Bhakti* has two broad varieties: that undertaken out of a sense of obligation or duty and that undertaken out of a feeling of longing for the deity. The Lord in his multi-armed forms and so forth is generally the object of obligatory *bhakti*. The Lord in his human-like forms is the object of *bhakti* in longing (8.6). By ninefold *bhakti* of either variety Kṛṣṇa is pleased and he bestows on those possessed of such *bhakti* the eternal domains they desire (8.5).<sup>77</sup> One should also worship the sacred basil plant, the *aśvattha* tree, the *dhātrī* bush, and so forth and reside in the holy land (8.7), which for Baladeva's tradition is the area around the city of Mathura in the modern Indian state called Uttar Pradesh. This is where Kṛṣṇa is believed to have lived approximately five thousand years ago. A wise man of position in society should perform the prescribed regular and occasional rites for the benefit of the rest of society without losing sight of the importance of *bhakti* (8.8). The ten offences to the holy names should be avoided with great care (8.9).<sup>78</sup> *Bhakti* that has as its only goal the attainment of the company of Kṛṣṇa is called single-minded. If it is preceded by knowledge and detachment, it produces its result immediately (8.10).

In the ninth and final chapter, Baladeva discusses the means or sources of knowledge (*pramāṇa*). He begins with a quote from the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (11.19.17) that lists four valid means of knowledge: verbal testimony (*śruti*), sensory perception (*pratyakṣa*), tradition (*aitihya*), and inference (*anumāna*). Since tradition is included in sensory perception (as the perception of some

---

<sup>77</sup>The nine forms or dimensions of *bhakti* are: hearing about, glorifying, remembering, serving the feet of, offering things to, saluting, servitude towards, friendship towards, and offering oneself to Viṣṇu. See the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (7.5.23).

<sup>78</sup>The ten offences to the holy names are: blasphemy of the saintly, considering the names of Śiva to be independent of Viṣṇu, disrespecting one's guru, blaspheming the sacred scriptures and texts that agree with them, thinking the greatness of the names of Hari to be only exaggeration, imagining the meanings of the holy names in unauthorized ways, engaging in sinful acts on the strength of the names, thinking the names to be equal to other auspicious activities, instructing the names to someone who has no faith or interest, and not being pleased by the greatness of the names even after hearing of it. These are listed in the *Padma Purāṇa*.

ancient authority whose identity has been lost in the transmission), he says, there are really only three sources of valid knowledge and among them the chief one is verbal testimony (9.1). With the help of verbal testimony, perception and inference are corrected. In seeing illusory things like floating heads and so forth, perception is sometimes erroneous and so is inference in the case of a mountain with lots of smoke, but on which the fire has been put out by rain. Therefore, those two cannot be considered independent sources of knowledge (9.2-3). Inference that is supportive of verbal testimony is accepted, but dry inference, or inference for the sake of argument alone, is rejected (9.4). Since, says Baladeva, someone who does not know the Veda does not realize Brahman and Brahman is presented primarily in the *Upaniṣads*, verbal testimony (i.e. the testimony of the *Upaniṣads* and the scriptures based on them) is considered the main source of knowledge (9.5).

Baladeva ends his work with a summary of the teachings of Madhva:

In the opinion of Madhva:

Hari is the highest; the world is real; difference is real; living beings are the servants of Hari and have lower and higher conditions; liberation is the experience of one's own joy; pure *bhakti* is the means to that; perception, inference, and testimony are the three sources of knowledge; and Hari is known by all the scriptures.<sup>79</sup>

He then praises Madhva for formulating those nine truths and advises all men who are wise to keep them in their hearts. Finally, he prays that Murāri (Kṛṣṇa, and by double entendre, the fourth guru before him and/or his ancestor) will always remain in his heart.

---

<sup>79</sup>The verse is:

श्रीमध्वमते हरिः परतमः सत्यं जगत्तत्त्वतो  
भेदो जीवगणा हरेरनुचरा नीचोच्चभावं गताः ।  
मुक्तिर्नैजसुखानुभूतिरमला भक्तिश्च तत्साधनम्  
अक्षादित्रयं प्रमाणमखिलाम्नायैकवेद्यो हरिः ॥

## The Meaning of the *Necklace*

There are some substantial differences between the visions of the two forms of Vedānta we have been exploring here. Personality has been introduced into the picture of the absolute in Vaiṣṇava Vedānta. This makes the absolute something one can have a personal relationship with. Emphasis is thus shifted away from identifying with an impersonal absolute to attempting to establish an emotional, humanlike, relationship with an absolute person. This emotional relationship and the process of cultivation leading to it is called *bhakti*. The emotions, therefore, which are viewed as illusory and conducive to binding attachments in the Advaita system are given a new meaning and value in the Vaiṣṇava system. Love, the ultimate attachment, is rehabilitated and made the highest of goals, above even liberation in the Caitanya tradition, as long as it is love for the personal absolute. The relationship between this divine love called *preman* and ordinary human forms of love is complex. Love and emotional attachments to people and things other than the personal absolute are regarded as leading to binding attachments that bring on repeated birth and death. Nevertheless, the various forms of loving that are seen in human life are regarded as, in some distant way, modeled on ways of loving the personal absolute. Thus, one can to some degree learn to love the absolute by loving other human beings. Also, the literature of the emotions (which was highly developed in Indian classical literature and aesthetics) becomes central to the cultivation of *bhakti*. In this way there are some similarities between the theistic Vedānta of India and the monotheistic religions that originated in the Middle East.

Along with the personification of the absolute comes an engendering of the absolute as well. In most cases the absolute is regarded as male, but invariably “he” is seen intimately connected with a female counterpart or consort who completes him. Thus, gender becomes a way of understanding and relating to the absolute. The female component of the divine becomes recognized as the deity’s power. It is through this power that everything is accomplished. In Baladeva’s tradition, the female consort is identified as Rādhā who is the pleasure-force (*hlādinī-śakti*) of the internal or higher power of the absolute. She provides, for his tradition, the finest example of how to love the personal absolute, Kṛṣṇa. That love is envisioned as erotic love in its fullest expression. Ordinary living beings are



never able to love Kṛṣṇa as Rādhā does, however. They may, nevertheless, come under her influence and protection, assist her, and thereby participate on some level in the same powerful emotions she feels in her loving relationship with Kṛṣṇa. Living beings, thus, may become participants in and sharers of the absolute's eternal, ever-renewing experience of joy.

For the Vaiṣṇava Vedāntin, the vision of the absolute found in Advaita Vedānta is a genuine, but unfortunately incomplete vision of the truth. It is a vision of only the outermost extremities of the sacred world from such a distance that nothing distinct can be recognized. It is like the way a mountain appears in the distance: merely a blue mass with no distinguishing characteristics. On the other hand, for the Advaita Vedāntin, the vision of Kṛṣṇa as the absolute found in Vaiṣṇava Vedānta is also a genuine, but incomplete vision of the nature of the absolute. Kṛṣṇa is Brahman characterized by ignorance. When ignorance is overcome, so is Kṛṣṇa.

In spite of the differences, much of what has been said about the meaning of the Advaita Vedānta tradition applies as well to the Vaiṣṇava Vedānta of Baladeva. It could be true in just the way its framers believed it was. Kṛṣṇa could be the supreme being who descends into the world from time to time to support the good and destroy those who have become evil. Beyond that, Kṛṣṇa occasionally bestows a special treat on the residents of different parts of the material world by pulling aside the curtain that ordinarily hides him from our view and showing us how he spends his eternity, loving and being loved. This is what the Vaiṣṇava believe happened some five thousand years ago in a place called Vṛndāvana, near Mathura in India. At present it is going on on some world in some other part of the universe. Like a travelling acting troop, Kṛṣṇa and his entourage move about the universe revealing his eternal play before all who have eyes to see. In this way Kṛṣṇa, the attractive, draws minds and hearts to him and away from involvement in the transitory world of birth and death. For those who are not fortunate enough to see Kṛṣṇa's sport first hand, there are the narratives and poetic accounts of his sport by those who are believed to have seen it, either directly or in meditation, to draw their minds. In this way everyone is eventually given a chance to be drawn by the beauty of the source of all beauty.

There have not been many efforts to interpret Vaiṣṇava Vedānta in terms unintended by its framers. Occasionally one finds attempts to inter-

pret Kṛṣṇa and his entourage metaphorically, that is, as personifications of various natural or psychological forces. Thus Kṛṣṇa is sometimes identified as the force of gravity and Rādhā as matter or the time-space continuum. In general Vaiṣṇava Vedānta does not lend itself to this type of interpretation as well as the Advaita Vedānta does.

If one turns to the third option for locating the truth of Vaiṣṇava Vedānta, one is again faced with the fact that people did and do believe in it. One then must ask what is the nature of its appeal for those people. If, as the French savant Georges Bataille suggests, religion is a quest for lost intimacy,<sup>80</sup> the Advaita and Caitanya forms of Vedānta have envisioned two quite different kinds of return to intimacy. The Advaita tradition seeks to recover intimacy by returning to Brahman and the Caitanya tradition seeks it by participating in the intimate interactions between deity and its pleasure-giving power. Very early in the Hindu tradition two paths, or modes of being, were recognized and contrasted with each other. The *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* puts it this way:

In the beginning this world was just a single body (*ātman*) shaped like a man. He looked around and saw nothing but himself. ...

That first being became afraid; therefore, one becomes afraid when one is alone. Then he thought to himself: "Of what should I be afraid, when there is no one but me?" So his fear left him, for what was he going to be afraid of? One is, after all, afraid of another.

He found no pleasure at all; so one finds no pleasure when one is alone. He wanted to have a companion. Now he was as large as a man and a woman in close embrace. So he split his body into two, giving rise to husband and wife. ...

He copulated with her, and from their union human beings were born.<sup>81</sup>

It is as if the Advaitin has preferred the path to fearlessness in abolishing the other and along with it the individual self, and the Vaiṣṇava has preferred the path to pleasure in affirming the other. In either case, powerful

---

<sup>80</sup>Georges Bataille, *Theory of Religion* (New York: Zone Books, 1989), p. 57.

<sup>81</sup>(Bṛh. U., 1.4.1-3) The translation is Olivelle's.

fantasy worlds are constructed, rich in the promise of recovered intimacy, for those who are drawn to them.

## The Commentaries, Editions, and Translations

The *Necklace of Truth-Jewels* has only two known commentaries, a traditional one called the *Kānti-mālā* or *Garland of Brightness* which is thought to have been written by one of Baladeva's disciples, Kṛṣṇadeva Vedāntavāgīśa. The author only refers to himself as Vedāntavāgīśa, not an uncommon title, in the commentary itself. The identification of the commentary's author with Kṛṣṇadeva is, therefore, uncertain. A modern, but learned commentary has been written by Akṣaya Kumāra Śarmā Śāstrī, who edited the text for the Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat. It is called simply the *Prabhā*, or the *Splendor of the Necklace of Truth-Jewels*. The *Garland* is a very brief, but insightful commentary, whereas the *Light* is much longer, very erudite, but perhaps less insightful. Both commentaries were used in making this translation.

There are only two editions of the text that I am aware of. One is the Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat's edition, edited by Akṣayakumāra Śarmā, which came out in 1927.<sup>82</sup> It has the text in Devanāgarī script along with the *Garland* and *Light* and a translation into Bengali. The other edition is by Haridāsa Śāstrī and contains only the *Garland* commentary and a Hindi translation. It was published in 1991 and contains as an accompanying text the *Nava-ratna* or *Nine Jewels* by Harirāma Vyāsa.<sup>83</sup> The edition of the Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat was the most useful for this translation. Haridāsa Śāstrī's edition was also occasionally consulted.

There is one prior translation of Baladeva's *Necklace of Truth-Jewels* into English done by Srisa Chandra Vasu. It was included as an appendix to Vasu's translation of Baladeva's *Govinda-bhāṣya* commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra*, which was published in 1912 as part of the Sacred Books of the Hin-

<sup>82</sup>Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, *Prameya-ratnāvalī*, edited by Akṣaya Kumāra Śarmā Śāstrī, with the *Kāntimālā* and the editor's own *Prabhā* (Calcutta: Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat, 1927).

<sup>83</sup>Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, *Prameya-ratnāvalī*, edited by Haridāsa Śāstrī, with the *Kāntimālā* and an accompanying work, the *Nava-ratna* of Harirāma Vyāsa (Kālīdaha, Vṛndāvana: Śrī Gadādhara Gaurahari Press, 1991).

dus series. That volume, with the appendix, was reprinted in 1979.<sup>84</sup> The translation is good, but dated, and is accompanied by the text. There are no English translations of either commentary.

---

<sup>84</sup>*The Vedānta-sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa* with the commentary of Baladeva, translated by Srisa Chandra Vasu. (New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1979)

## **Part I**

वेदान्तसारः

**Text One:**

**The Vedānta-sāra  
of  
Sadānanda**



# Chapter 1

## The Essentials of Vedānta

अखण्डं सच्चिदानन्दम्  
अवाङ्मनसगोचरम् ।  
आत्मानमखिलाधारम्  
आश्रयेऽभिष्टसिद्धये ॥ १ ॥

1. For the attainment of my desired goal, I seek shelter in the Self, the support of all, beyond the reach of speech and mind, unfragmented eternal existence, consciousness, and bliss.

अर्थतोऽप्यद्वयानन्दान्  
अतीतद्वैतभानतः ।  
गुरुनाराध्य वेदान्त -  
सारं वक्ष्ये यथामति ॥ २ ॥

2. After worshiping my revered teacher who, because he has moved beyond awareness of duality, is Non-dual Joy (Advayānanda) not just in name, I shall proclaim the “Essentials of Vedānta” according to my own understanding.

वेदान्तो नामोपनिषत्प्रमाणं तदुपकारीणि शारीरकसूत्रादीनि च ॥ ३ ॥

3. Vedānta, indeed, is the sources of knowledge, the Upaniṣads, and the Śārīraka-sūtra<sup>1</sup> and so forth<sup>2</sup> which support them.

अस्य वेदान्तप्रकरणत्वात्तदीयैरेवानुबन्धैस्तद्वत्तासिद्धेर्न ते पृथगालोचनीयाः ॥ ४ ॥

4. Because this is a specialized treatise of Vedānta, its preliminaries<sup>3</sup> are supplied by the preliminaries of that [Vedānta], and thus they shall not be reflected on separately.

## 1.1 The Preliminaries

तत्रानुबन्धो नामाधिकारिविषयसम्बन्धप्रयोजनानि ॥ ५ ॥

5. There the preliminaries are the qualified student, the subject matter, the relationship, and the purpose.

### 1.1.1 The Qualified Student

अधिकारी तु विधिवदधीतवेदवेदाङ्गत्वेनापाततोऽधिगताखिलवेदार्थोऽस्मिन् जन्मनि जन्मान्तरे वा काम्यनिषिद्धवर्जनपुरसरं नित्यनैमित्तिकप्रायश्चित्तोपासनानुष्ठानेन निर्गतनिखिलकल्मषतया नितान्तनिर्मलस्वान्तः साधनचतुष्टयसम्पन्नः प्रमाता ॥ ६ ॥

<sup>1</sup>The Śārīraka-sūtra is also known as the Vedānta-sūtra or Brahma-sūtra of Bādarāyaṇa. Śārīraka means “the condition or state of being embodied” and thus refers to the condition of the living being (jīva), and sūtra means aphorism or brief, easily memorized statement. Thus, Śārīraka-sūtra means “aphorisms concerning the condition of embodied beings.”

<sup>2</sup>Also included here are the Bhagavad-gītā, the commentaries on the Brahma-sūtra and Bhagavad-gītā and other independent works (prakaraṇa) on the nature of the Self (ātman).

<sup>3</sup>The word here is anubandha which is difficult to translate. The word literally means “binding after.” This could mean that the four anubandha are meant to “bind” or “connect” the reader to the work by describing who it is meant for, what its subject is, what the relationship of the work to the subject is, and what the ultimate purpose of the work is. Or, it could mean that these four topics are simply areas following along with the topic that should be discussed. With “preliminaries” I hope to capture a bit of both meanings.



6. The qualified student, however, is a knower who, by having read the Vedas and Vedāṅgas<sup>4</sup> according to injunction, has understood on a theoretical level the meanings of all the Vedas, whose mind is extremely pure because all the impurities have been removed through the performance, either in this birth or in another, of the obligatory, occasional, expiatory, and meditative rites, after giving up both desirable and prohibited actions, and who has succeeded at the four cultivations (*sādhana*).

काम्यानि स्वर्गादीष्टसाधनानि ज्योतिष्टोमादीनि ॥ ७ ॥

7. Desirable actions are rites like the Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice<sup>5</sup> that bring about desired results [for the performer], like heaven and so forth.

निषिद्धानि नरकाद्यनिष्टसाधनानि ब्राह्मणहननादीनि ॥ ८ ॥

8. Prohibited actions are acts like the killing of *brāhmaṇa* that bring about undesired results like [residence in] hell and so forth.

नित्यान्यकरणे प्रत्यवायसाधनानि सन्ध्यावन्दनादीनि ॥ ९ ॥

9. Obligatory rites are prayers at the day's junctures<sup>6</sup> and so forth which, if not performed, bring about sin.

नैमित्तिकानि पुत्रजन्माद्यनुबन्धीनि जातेष्ट्यादीनि ॥ १० ॥

10. Occasional rites are rituals like the Jāteṣṭi<sup>7</sup> that are connected with [occasions like] the birth of a son and so forth.

प्रायश्चित्तानि पापक्षयसाधनानि चान्द्रायणादीनि ॥ ११ ॥

11. Rites of expiation are rites like the Cāndrāyaṇa<sup>8</sup> that bring about the destruction of sins.

<sup>4</sup>The traditional ancillary sciences are: pronunciation, prosody, grammar, etymology, astronomy, and ritual.

<sup>5</sup>This is a sacrifice also known as the *agniṣṭoma*, or "hymns to fire."

<sup>6</sup>The day's junctures are the transitional periods in a day, like dawn, noon, and sunset, when nighttime passes into morning, morning into afternoon, and afternoon into evening. Vedic prayers, especially the sacred *gāyatrī mantra*, are to be recited during these periods.

<sup>7</sup>The Jāteṣṭi is a Vedic rite that is performed by a father on the occasion of the birth of a son.

<sup>8</sup>The Cāndrāyaṇa is a month-long fast in which food is gradually decreased and then increased in accordance with the waning and waxing of the moon (*candra*).

उपासनानि सगुणब्रह्मविषयमानसव्यापाररूपाणि शाण्डिल्यविद्यादी-  
नि ॥ १२ ॥

12. Meditations, like the teaching of Śāṇḍilya,<sup>9</sup> are mental acts that have as their object qualified Brahman.

एतेषां नित्यादीनां बुद्धिशुद्धिः परमं प्रयोजनम् । उपासनानां तु चि-  
त्तैकाग्र्यम् । तमेतमात्मानं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेने-  
त्यादिश्रुतेः तपसा कल्मषं हन्तीत्यादिस्मृतेश्च ॥ १३ ॥

13. The highest purpose of these rites, headed by obligatory rites, is purification of the intellect; but meditations have focusing of the reflective mind [as their purpose]. [This is known] from the revealed text (*śruti*): “Seekers of Brahman want to know that Self by reciting the Vedas, by sacrifice”, (Brh. U., 4.4.22) and from the tradition (*smṛti*): “By austerity one destroys impurities,” (Manu Saṃ., 12.109).

नित्यनैमित्तिकयोरुपासनानां चावान्तरफलं पितृलोकसत्यलोकप्राप्तिः  
कर्मणा पितृलोको विद्यया देवलोक इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥ १४ ॥

14. The obligatory and occasional rites as well as the meditations have as lesser results the gaining of the world of the ancestors (Pitṛloka) and the world of truth (Satyaloka).<sup>10</sup> [This is known] from the revealed text: “By rites the world of the ancestors, by knowledge [i.e. meditation] the world of the gods [are won],” (Brh. U., 1.5.16).

#### 1.1.1.1 The Four Cultivations

साधनानि नित्यानित्यवस्तुविवेकेहामुत्रफलभोगविरागशमादिषट्कसम्प-  
त्तिमुमुक्षुत्वानि ॥ १५ ॥

<sup>9</sup>The Śāṇḍilya is a passage from the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (Chānd. U., 3.14) that is a well known meditative exercise directed at qualified Brahman or Brahman with qualities (*saguṇa-brahman*). Qualified Brahman is deity understood as an omniscient, omnipotent being that is a person or that has personal traits. Unqualified Brahman, an impersonal ultimate without any characteristics, is considered the highest reality in this system of Advaita Vedānta.

<sup>10</sup>This is the highest of the seven upper worlds, according to Hindu cosmology, the world of the creator god Brahmā (masculine, different from Brahma or Brahman which is grammatically neuter).

15. The cultivations are the ability to discriminate between eternal and non-eternal things (1), indifference to the enjoyment of this-worldly and other-worldly results (2), the six excellences headed by control of the mind (3), and being desirous of liberation (4).<sup>11</sup>

नित्यानित्यवस्तुविवेकस्तावद्ब्रह्मैव नित्यं वस्तु ततोऽन्यदखिलमनित्य-  
मितिविवेचनम् ॥ १६ ॥

16. First of all, discrimination of eternal from non-eternal things is the discriminating awareness: "Brahman alone is the eternal substance; everything other than that is non-eternal."

ऐहिकानां स्रक्चन्दनवनितादिविषयभोगाणां कर्मजन्यतयानित्यत्ववद्  
आमुष्मिकाणामप्यमृतादिविषयभोगाणामनित्यतया तेभ्यो नितरां वि-  
रक्तिरिहामुत्रफलभोगविरागः ॥ १७ ॥

17. Just as enjoyment of the things of this world, like garlands, sandal-wood, women, and so forth, being produced by action, is non-eternal, so is the enjoyment of the objects of that world [the heavenly world], like ambrosia, etc., non-eternal. Complete disengagement from them is indifference to the enjoyment of this-worldly and other-worldly results.

शमादयस्तु शमदमोपरतितितिक्षासमाधानश्रद्धाख्याः ॥ १८ ॥

18. [The excellences] headed by control of the mind are known as: control of the mind, control of the senses, cessation [of sense engagement], endurance, contemplation, and faith.

शमस्तावत् श्रवणादिव्यतिरिक्तविषयेभ्यो मनसो निग्रहः ॥ १९ ॥

19. Firstly, control of the mind is holding the mind back from objects other than hearing [the revealed texts], and so forth.

दमो बाह्येन्द्रियाणां तद्व्यतिरिक्तविषयेभ्यो निवर्तनम् ॥ २० ॥

20. Control of the senses is the turning away of the external senses from objects other than those things [i.e., the hearing, etc. that bring about knowledge of the Self].

<sup>11</sup>The order that these are given in is important. The prior cultivation is the condition for the following one. First one learns to discriminate between eternal and non-eternal things. Then one becomes indifferent to enjoyment (because it is temporary). Then one cultivates the six excellences, and finally, one develops a strong desire for liberation.

निवर्तितानामेतेषां तद्व्यतिरिक्तविषयेभ्य उपरमणमुपरतिः । अथवा वि-  
हितानां कर्मणां विधिना परित्यागः ॥ २१ ॥

21. Cessation is the complete disengagement from their objects of the senses, that were previously [only] turned away from those objects, apart from those [hearing, etc. that bring about knowledge of the Self]. Or, cessation is the abandonment of prescribed ritual acts according to rule.<sup>12</sup>

तितिक्षा शीतोष्णादिद्वन्द्वसहिष्णुता ॥ २२ ॥

22. Endurance is toleration of the dualities of cold and heat, etc.

निगृहीतस्य मनसः श्रवणादौ तदनुगुणविषये च समाधिः समाधानम् ॥  
२३ ॥

23. Contemplation is concentration of the controlled mind on hearing, etc. and on the objects appropriate to those.

गुरूपदिष्टवेदान्तवाक्येषु विश्वासः श्रद्धा ॥ २४ ॥

24. Faith is trust in the statements of the Vedānta as taught by the teacher.

मुमुक्षुत्वं मोक्षेच्छा ॥ २५ ॥

25. Being desirous of liberation is the desire for freedom [from bondage].

एवम्भूतः प्रमाताधिकारी । शान्तो दान्त इत्यादिश्रुतेः । उक्तं च

प्रशान्तचित्ताय जितेन्द्रियाय च  
प्रहीणदोषाय यथोक्तकारिणे  
गुणान्वितायानुगताय सर्वदा  
प्रदेयमेतत् सततं मुमुक्षवे ॥ इति ॥ २६ ॥

26. This sort of knower is the qualified student. [This is known] from revealed texts like: “Therefore, controlled of mind and sense, uninvolved, tolerant [of heat and cold, etc.], and concentrated, a knower of such [i.e.

<sup>12</sup>This refers to renunciation or *sannyāsa*, the giving up of prescribed rituals by the highest class (*varṇa*), the *brāhmaṇa* class, in the fourth or last stage of life (*āśrama*).

that the Self is not connected with action and result of action] sees the Self in the self and the Self in all" (Brh. U., 4.4.23).<sup>13</sup> And it is said:

To one of peaceful mind and conquered sense,  
Whose faults are destroyed, who acts as enjoined,  
Endowed with quality and always following,  
To him, who wants liberation, should this always be given.  
(*Upadeśa-sāhasrī*, 324, [16.72])

### 1.1.2 The Subject

विषयो जीवब्रह्मैक्यं शुद्धचैतन्यं प्रमेयम् । तत्रैव वेदान्तानां तात्पर्यात् ॥  
२७ ॥

27. The subject matter [of Vedānta and this work] is the truth of pure consciousness which is the oneness of the living being (*jīva*) and Brahman, because that, indeed, is the intended meaning of the Vedānta texts.

### 1.1.3 The Relationship

सम्बन्धस्तु तदैक्यप्रमेयस्य तत्प्रतिपादकोपनिषत्प्रमाणस्य च बोध्यबो-  
धकभावः ॥ २८ ॥

28. The relationship is that of making known and being made known, which exists between the means of knowledge, the Upanṣiads that establish that [knowledge], and the object of knowledge, that is, the oneness of those [the living being and Brahman].

### 1.1.4 The Purpose

प्रयोजनं तु तदैक्यप्रमेयगताज्ञाननिवृत्तिः स्वस्वरूपानन्दावाप्तिश्च । तर-  
ति शोकमात्मवितित्यादिश्रुतेः । ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवतीत्यादिश्रुतेश्च ॥  
२९ ॥

<sup>13</sup>The complete statement is:

शान्तो दान्त उपरतस्तिक्षुः समाहितो भूत्वात्मन्येवात्मानं पश्यति.

29. The purpose [of Vedānta and this work] is (1) ending the ignorance relating to the object of knowledge, [which is] the oneness of them [the living being and Brahman], and (2) attaining the joy of one's own true nature. [This is known] from revealed texts like: "The knower of the Self crosses over sorrow" (Chānd. U., 7.1.3) and "He knows Brahman [and] becomes Brahman," (Muṇḍa. U., 3.2.9).

### 1.1.5 The Student's Duty

अयमधिकारी जननमरणादिसंसारानलसन्तप्तो दीप्तशिरा जलराशि-  
मिवोपहारपाणिः श्रोत्रियं ब्रह्मनिष्ठं गुरुमुपसृत्य तमनुसरति ।

तद्विज्ञानार्थं स गुरुमेवाभिगच्छेत् ।  
समित्पाणिः श्रोत्रियं ब्रह्मनिष्ठम् ॥ इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥ ३० ॥

30. Just as a man with his head on fire [runs] to water, a qualified student, burned by the fires of worldly existence such as birth and death, goes, gift in hand, to a teacher versed in the Vedas and situated in Brahman and follows him. [This is known] from revealed texts like:

To know that, he, with firewood [gift]<sup>14</sup> in hand,  
Should approach a teacher,  
Who is versed in Veda  
And situated in Brahman. (Muṇḍa. U., 1.2.12)

### 1.1.6 The Teacher's Duty

स गुरुः परमकृपयाध्यारोपापवादन्यायेनैवमुपदिशति ।

<sup>14</sup>The wood is symbolic of a willingness in the student to serve the teacher by collecting wood for his fire or for use in sacred rites involving fire.

तस्मै स विद्वानुपसन्नाय सम्यक्  
 प्रशान्तचित्ताय शमान्विताय ।  
 येनाक्षरं पुरुषं वेद सत्यं  
 प्रोवाच तां तत्त्वतो ब्रह्मविद्याम् ॥ इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥ ३१ ॥

31. That teacher, out of great compassion, instructs him by the method of superimposition and then disabusal. [This is known] from revealed texts like:

That learned one taught him,  
 Who has approached him completely,  
 With a peaceful mind and controlled senses,  
 That knowledge of Brahman as it is,  
 By which he knew the true,  
 And undiminishing Self. (Muṇḍa. U., 1.2.13)

## 1.2 Superimposition

असर्पभूतायां रज्जौ सर्पारोपवद्वस्तुन्यवस्त्वारोपोऽध्यारोपः ॥ ३२ ॥

32. Superimposition is the imposition of what is not real onto something real, like the imposition of a snake onto a rope, though it is not a snake.

वस्तु सच्चिदानन्दमद्वयं ब्रह्म । अज्ञानादिसकलजडसमूहोऽवस्तु ॥ ३३ ॥

33. The “real” is non-dual Brahman which is eternal existence, consciousness, and joy. The “non-real” is the collection of all unconscious (*jaḍa*) objects headed by ignorance.<sup>15</sup>

अज्ञानं तु सदसद्भ्यामनिर्वचनीयं त्रिगुणात्मकं ज्ञानविरोधि भावरूपं य-  
 त्किञ्चिदिति वदन्ति । अहमज्ञ इत्याद्यनुभवात्देवात्मशक्तिं स्वगुणैर्निगू-  
 ढामित्यादिश्रुतेश्च ॥ ३४ ॥

<sup>15</sup>That is to say all the unconscious objects headed by ignorance (*ajñāna*) are imposed or superimposed upon non-dual Brahman.

34. They [the knowers of the truth] say that ignorance is something that cannot be described as either existent or non-existent, that it consists of the three *guṇa*,<sup>16</sup> and that it is in opposition to knowledge. [This is known] from the experience: “I am ignorant” and from revealed texts like: “The personal power of the deity, hidden by its own *guṇa*” (Śvet. U., 1.3).

### 1.2.1 Collective and Distributive Ignorance

इदमज्ञानं समष्टिव्यष्ट्यभिप्रायेणैकमनेकमिति च व्यवह्रियते ॥ ३५ ॥

35. And this ignorance is referred to either as one, when one’s intention is collective, or as many, when one’s intention is distributive.

तथाहि यथा वृक्षाणां समष्ट्यभिप्रायेण वनमित्येकत्वव्यपदेशो यथा वा जलानां समष्ट्यभिप्रायेण जलाशय इति तथा नानात्वेन प्रतिभासमानानां जीवगताज्ञानानां समष्ट्यभिप्रायेण तदेकत्वव्यपदेशः । अजामेकामित्यादिश्रुतेः ॥ ३६ ॥

36. For example, just as when trees are intended collectively they are referred to singularly as a forest, or as when waters are intended collectively

<sup>16</sup>*Guṇa* means the three strands or threads of material nature out of which all material objects are woven. The *guṇa* are technical terms of importance in Vedānta as well as in Sāṅkhya and Yoga. The word *guṇa* may mean “quality,” a secondary element or subordinate part, as well as “thread” or “rope,” The *Bhāratīya Darśana Kośa* (vol. 2, pp. 23-24) explains how these three ideas can be applied to this technical use of *guṇa* as follows: “The *guṇa* are the primary constituents (or material causes, *upādāna*) of all effects. They are substances (*dravya*) because they have qualities themselves like conjunction and disjunction and so forth, do not reside in any other substance, and are the constituents of effects. They thus cannot be “qualities” (*guṇa*) according to the Vaiśeṣika and other schools. Still, since they are the accessories of the spirit (*puruṣa*) (i.e., they are enjoyable by it), they are called *guṇa* (secondary, since objects that are enjoyed exist for the sake of another and thus are subordinate or secondary with respect to the enjoyer). Also since they bind the spirit like ropes bind beasts, those three are called *guṇa* (strand or rope).” The *guṇa* are *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*. *Sattva* is the stuff of the good or goodness. It illumines and is the cause of happiness. *Rajas* consists of passion and is the cause of misery. *Tamas*, which brings lethargy, is an obscuror and is the cause of delusion. These three woven together in differing proportions make up all material things.



they are referred to as a reservoir,<sup>17</sup> so when the limited ignorances in the living beings which appear as many are intended collectively, they are referred to as one. [This is known] from revealed texts like: “One unborn female” (Śvet. U., 4.5).<sup>18</sup>

### 1.2.2 Collective Ignorance

इयं समष्टिरुत्कृष्टोपाधितया विशुद्धसत्त्वप्रधाना ॥ ३७ ॥

37. This collective [ignorance] as the superior attribute is predominantly pure *sattva*.<sup>19</sup>

एतदुपहितं चैतन्यं सर्वज्ञत्वसर्वेश्वरत्वसर्वनियन्तृत्वादिगुणकमव्यक्तम-  
न्तर्यामी जगत्कारणमीश्वर इति च व्यपदिश्यते सकलाज्ञानावभास-  
कत्वात् । यः सर्वज्ञः सर्वविदिति श्रुतेः ॥ ३८ ॥

38. Consciousness characterized by this [collective ignorance] has the qualities of all-knower-ness, all-controller-ness, all-regulator-ness, and so forth and is referred to as the unmanifested, the inner ruler, the cause of the world, and the lord, because of illuminating the ignorances of all [beings]. [This is known] from the revealed text, “He who is the knower of all [in general], the knower of all [in particular]” (Muṇḍa U., 1.1.9).<sup>20</sup>

<sup>17</sup>Two examples, forest/trees and reservoir/waters, are used throughout this text because they represent the differing paradigms of the two major schools or traditions of Advaita Vedānta. The forest/tree example follows the understanding of Vācaspati Miśra as set forth in his sub-commentary called *Bhāmatī* on Śaṅkara’s commentary on the *Brahma-sūtra*. According to him Brahman is limited by ignorance in bringing about the manifestation of the world. The reservoir/waters example follows Prakāśātman Yati in his sub-sub-commentary called *Vivaraṇa* on the sub-commentary of Padmapāda on the commentary of Śaṅkara on the *Brahma-sūtra*. There Brahman is merely reflected in ignorance, as the sky is reflected in water, in bringing about the manifestation of the world. The author of the *Essentials* is being inclusive in adopting this approach.

<sup>18</sup>Here ignorance or material nature (*prakṛti*) is referred to in the singular, accusative case and is also represented in the feminine grammatical gender. The whole verse is: “One unborn male, becoming attached, lies with the one unborn female colored red, white and black, and producing many progeny of similar form. The other unborn male leaves her behind having enjoyed her.” “Unborn” here can also mean goat.

<sup>19</sup>Pure *sattva* here means *sattva* unmixed with the other two *guṇa*: *rajas* and *tamas*.

<sup>20</sup>This passage uses two words for “to know”: *jñā* and *vid*. The commentators suggest

ईश्वरस्येयं समष्टिरखिलकारणत्वात्कारणशरीरमानन्दप्रचुरत्वात्कोशव-  
दाच्छादकत्वाच्चानन्दमयकोशः सर्वोपरमत्वात् सुषुप्तिरतएव स्थूलसू-  
क्ष्मप्रपञ्चलयस्थानमिति चोच्यते ॥ ३९ ॥

39. The lord's collectivity [of ignorance] is called his causal body because it is the cause of all things, his joyful wrapping because it is abundant in joy and covers like a wrapping, and his deep [dreamless] sleep because it is the cessation of everything and, therefore, is the place of the dissolution of manifestations both subtle and gross.

यथा वनस्य व्यष्ट्यभिप्रायेण वृक्षा इत्यनेकत्वव्यपदेशो यथा वा जला-  
शयस्य व्यष्ट्यभिप्रायेण जलानीति तथाज्ञानस्य व्यष्ट्यभिप्रायेण तदने-  
कत्वव्यपदेशः । इन्द्रो मायाभिः पुरुरूप ईयत इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥ ४० ॥

40. Just as when a forest is intended distributively it is referred to as many, i.e. as "trees," or when a reservoir is intended distributively it is referred to as "waters," so when ignorance is intended distributively it is referred to as many. [This is known] from the revealed text: "The lord through his powers [ignorances] is perceived in many forms" (Rg Veda, 6.47.18).

अत्र समस्तव्यस्तव्यापित्वेन समष्टिव्यष्टिताव्यपदेशः ॥ ४१ ॥

41. Depending on whether it pervades the whole or the parts, a collective or distributive usage is applied to it [ignorance].

### 1.2.3 Distributive Ignorance

इयं व्यष्टिर्निकृष्टोपाधितया मलिनसत्त्वप्रधाना ॥ ४२ ॥

42. This distributive [ignorance] as the inferior attribute is predominately polluted *sattva*.<sup>21</sup>

एतदुपहितं चैतन्यमल्पज्ञत्वानीश्वरत्वादिगुणकं प्राज्ञ इत्युच्यत एकाज्ञा-  
नावभासकत्वादस्य प्राज्ञत्वमस्पष्टोपाधितयानतिप्रकाशकत्वात् ॥ ४३ ॥

that the first means to know in a general way and the second to know in a particular or specific way.

<sup>21</sup>Compare this with the ignorance of the Lord in para. 37 which is pure *sattva*. Here the *sattva* is overcome by *rajas* and *tamas* and is therefore called polluted.

43. Consciousness characterized by this [distributive ignorance] has the qualities of limited knowledge, limited control, and so forth, and is called *prājñā* [fragmental intelligence].<sup>22</sup> Because it illumines only one ignorance, it is fragmental intelligence and because its attribute is unclear [i.e., polluted], it does not illumine very much.

अस्यापीयमहङ्कारादिकारणत्वात्कारणशरीरमानन्दप्रचूरत्वात् कोशव-  
दाच्छादकत्वाच्चानन्दमयकोशः सर्वोपरमत्वात्सुषुप्तिरतएव स्थूलसूक्ष्म-  
शरीरप्रपञ्चलयस्थानमिति चोच्यते ॥ ४४ ॥

44. Its distributive ignorance, too, because it is the cause of the ego and so forth, is called the “causal body;” because it has an abundance of joy and covers like a wrapping, it is called the “joyful wrapping” (*ānandamaya-kośa*); and, because it is the cessation of all, it is called deep sleep. Therefore it is the place of the dissolution of the manifestation of the subtle and gross bodies.

तदानीमेतावीश्वरप्राज्ञौ चैतन्यप्रदीप्ताभिरतिसूक्ष्माभिरज्ञानवृत्तिभिरान-  
न्दमनुभवत आनन्दभुक् चेतोमुखः प्राज्ञ इतिश्रुतेः सुखमहमस्वाप्सं न  
किञ्चिदवेदिषमित्युत्थितस्य परामर्शोपपत्तेश्च ॥ ४५ ॥

45. Then [in deep sleep] those two, the Lord and the *prājñā*, experience joy through the very subtle operations of ignorance illumined by consciousness. [This is known] from the revealed text: “the *prājñā* experiences joy revealed through consciousness” (Māṇḍ. U., 5) and from consistency with the reflection of one who has just awakened: “I slept pleasantly and was not aware of anything.”

### 1.2.4 Non-difference

अनयोः समष्टिव्यष्ट्योर्वनवृक्षयोरिव जलाशयजलयोरिव वाभेदः ॥ ४६ ॥

46. Those two, the collective and distributive ignorances, like the forest and its trees or the reservoir and its waters, are not different.

<sup>22</sup>This is a technical term in Vedānta, adopted from the Upaniṣads, for the conditioned living being. Rāma Tīrtha glosses this term with the phrase *prāyeṇa ajñāḥ*, “predominately ignorant.”

एतदुपहितयोरीश्वरप्राज्ञयोरपि वनवृक्षावच्छिन्नाकाशयोरिव जलाशय-  
जलतद्गतप्रतिबिम्बाकाशयोरिव वाभेद एष सर्वेश्वर एष सर्वज्ञ एषोऽन्त-  
र्याम्येष योनिः सर्वस्य प्रभवाप्ययौ हि भूतानामित्यादिश्रुतेः ॥ ४७ ॥

47. The two characterized by those [ignorances], the Lord and the *prājña*, are also not different, like the sky delimited by a forest and that delimited by a tree [in that forest] or that reflected in a reservoir and that reflected in some part of its water.<sup>23</sup> [This is known] from the revealed text: “this one is the lord of all, this one the knower of all, this one the inner ruler, this one the womb of all, the birth and death of all beings” (Māṇḍ. U., 6).<sup>24</sup>

### 1.2.5 The Fourth

वनवृक्षतदवच्छिन्नाकाशयोर्जलाशयजलतद्गतप्रतिबिम्बाकाशयोर्वा आ-  
धारभूतानुपहिताकाशवदनयोरज्ञानतदुपहितचैतन्ययोराधारभूतं यदनु-  
पहितं चैतन्यं तत्तुरीयमित्युच्यते शान्तं शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यते स  
आत्मा स विज्ञेय इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥ ४८ ॥

48. Uncharacterized consciousness, which is the basis of the two [types] of consciousness characterized by those ignorances, is called the Fourth (*turīya*). It is just like the uncharacterized sky which is the basis of the “skies” delimited by the forest and its trees or of the “skies” reflected in the reservoir and its waters. [This is known] from the revealed text: “the peaceful, the auspicious, the non-dual is considered the Fourth. That is the Self; that is to be known” (Māṇḍ. U., 7).

इदमेव तुरीयं शुद्धचैतन्यमज्ञानादितदुपहितचैतन्याभ्यां तप्तायःपिण्ड-  
वदविविक्तं सन्महावाक्यस्य वाच्यं विविक्तं सल्लक्ष्यमिति चोच्यते ॥ ४९ ॥

<sup>23</sup>Consciousness is compared with space or the sky and ignorance with a forest and its trees or a reservoir and its waters. That part of space occupied by the forest and the tree or reflected in the whole reservoir and in some small portion of its waters is compared with conscious beings, that is, with the Lord in the case of the forest or reservoir and the limited living being in the case of the tree or waters. As mentioned earlier, the sky reflected in the reservoir or in some part of its waters is the example most appropriate to the Vivaraṇa school of Advaita Vedānta.

<sup>24</sup>This passage in context proclaims the unity of the limited living being with the Lord of all beings. “This one” refers to the living being.

49. This Fourth is pure consciousness which, when undifferentiated from ignorance and the consciousnesses characterized by those ignorances, like a heated lump of iron [in which fire and iron are not differentiated],<sup>25</sup> is said to be the direct meaning<sup>26</sup> of the great [Upaniṣadic] pronouncement<sup>27</sup> and, when differentiated from them, is its indirect meaning.<sup>28</sup>

### 1.2.6 Two Powers of Ignorance: the Enshrouding Power

अस्याज्ञानस्यावरणविक्षेपनामकं शक्तिद्वयमस्ति । आवरणशक्तिस्ता-  
वदल्पोऽपि मेघोऽनेकयोजनायतमादित्यमण्डलमवलोकयितृनयनपथ-  
पिधायकतया यथाच्छादयतीव तथाज्ञानं परिच्छिन्नमप्यात्मानमपरि-  
च्छिन्नमसंसारिणमवलोकयितृबुद्धिपिधायकतयाच्छादयतीव । तादृशं  
सामर्थ्यम् । तदुक्तम्

<sup>25</sup>This is the first occurrence of an example that appears several times in this text. It establishes a similarity between the way in which the attributes of fire are attributed to iron in the case of a heated lump of iron, though fire and iron are two distinct substances, and the way that the attributes of pure consciousness are sometimes attributed to ignorance. Thus one can say: “this iron burns” or “this person is conscious” (only consciousness is conscious and not the psyche and body of the person).

<sup>26</sup>Direct meaning (*vācya*) is the directly denoted meaning of a word or sentence. This is the strictly grammatical meaning of a statement. Indirect meaning (*lakṣaṇā*) is the implied or intended meaning of a word or sentence. An indirect meaning is resorted to when the direct meaning is in some way problematic. These terms are borrowed from the discussions of interpretation that occurred in the Mīmāṃsā school of Indian philosophy and from the tradition of classical literary criticism.

<sup>27</sup>The great Upaniṣadic pronouncement (*mahā-vākya*) referred to here is *tat tvam asi*, or “That you are” (in idiomatic English: “You are that - you are Brahman”). “That” refers to uncharacterized Brahman and “you” to characterized Brahman. This is the chief of the four great pronouncements found in the Upaniṣads and the one that most of this text is a commentary on. It occurs nine times in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, Sixth Chapter, Sections Eight through Sixteen.

<sup>28</sup>In this paragraph two interpretations, the direct and the indirect, are given for the great pronouncement “That you are” (*tat tvam asi*). The direct interpretation identifies Brahman with the inner Self and thus requires that pure Brahman and the conditioned being not be distinguished. If they are distinguished, as they strictly speaking should be, the direct meaning fails and an indirect meaning is resorted to in which the pure Brahman aspects of the two are identified. More will be said about this in paras. 116-122 of this text.

घनच्छन्नदृष्टिर्घनच्छन्नमर्कं  
 यथा निष्प्रभं मन्यते चातिमूढः ।  
 तथा बद्धवद्भाति यो मूढदृष्टेः  
 स नित्योपलब्धिस्वरूपोऽहमात्मा ॥ ५० ॥

50. This ignorance has two powers called the enshrouding and the projecting powers. As a cloud, though small in size, appears to cover the sun though many miles in width, by blocking the path of the eyes of the observer, so does ignorance, limited, appear to cover the Self which is not limited and not involved in the world, by blocking the intellect of the observer. Such a capacity is the enshrouding power. That is stated:

And as a very foolish one  
 Whose line of sight is blocked by cloud  
 Thinks the covered sun lustreless,  
 So that one, too, appears as bound  
 Because of befuddled vision  
 Whose essence is eternal awareness;  
 That Self indeed am I. (*Hastāmalaka*, 10)

अनयावृतस्यात्मनः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वसुखित्वदुःखित्वादिसंसारसम्भाव-  
 नाऽपि भवति यथा स्वाज्ञानेनावृतायां रज्ज्वां सर्पत्वसम्भावना ॥ ५१ ॥

51. As the possibility of being [seen as] a snake arises in a rope that is covered by ignorance of it, so does the possibility of mundane forms of existence such as being an agent, an enjoyer, happy, sad, and so forth arise in the Self covered by that [enshrouding] power.

### 1.2.7 The Projecting Power

विक्षेपशक्तिस्तु यथा रज्ज्वज्ञानं स्वावृतरज्जौ स्वशक्त्या सर्पादिकमु-  
 द्भावयत्येवमज्ञानमपि स्वावृतात्मनि स्वशक्त्याकाशादिप्रपञ्चमुद्भावयति ।  
 तादृशं सामर्थ्यम् । तदुक्तं विक्षेपशक्तिर्लिङ्गादिब्रह्माण्डान्तं जगत् सृजे-  
 दिति ॥ ५२ ॥

52. Just as ignorance of a rope causes, by its own power, the appearance of a snake in a rope covered by it, so does ignorance cause, by its own power, the appearance of space, etc. in the Self that has been covered by it. Such a capacity is the projecting power. That is described: “the projecting power creates the universe from the subtle bodies to the cosmic egg” (*Vākya-sudhā*, 13).<sup>29</sup>

### 1.2.8 Causality

शक्तिद्वयवदज्ञानोपहितं चैतन्यं स्वप्रधानतया निमित्तं स्वोपाधिप्रधान-  
तयोपादानं च भवति । यथा लूता तन्तुकार्यं प्रति स्वप्रधानतया निमित्तं  
स्वशरीरप्रधानतयोपादानं च भवति ॥ ५३ ॥

53. Consciousness characterized by ignorance possessed of those two powers is the instrumental cause when it is itself predominant and the material cause when its attribute [ignorance] is predominant, just as a spider with respect to its effect, its web, is the instrumental cause when it is itself predominant and the material cause when its body is predominant.<sup>30</sup>

### 1.2.9 Elemental Creation

तमःप्रधानविक्षेपशक्तिमदज्ञानोपहितचैतन्यादाकाश आकाशाद्वायुर्वा-  
योरग्निरग्नेरापोऽह्नः पृथिवी चोत्पद्यते तस्माद्वैतस्मादात्मन आकाशः  
सम्भूत इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥ ५४ ॥

<sup>29</sup>One might think of these two “powers” of ignorance as an analysis of the function of ignorance into two phases. The first phase is that in which the true nature of an object is “covered” by ignorance of what that object really is. The second phase creates the illusion that that object is something other than what it is.

<sup>30</sup>An instrumental cause (*nimitta-kāraṇa*) is a cause that aids in the production of an effect. The classic example is the stick or wheel of the potter. The material cause (*upādāna-kāraṇa*) is the material out of which an effect is produced, in the case of the creation of pottery, the clay. Thus, when consciousness is dominant in the causation of this universe, consciousness characterized by ignorance is the instrumental cause and when the ignorance that characterizes consciousness is dominant, consciousness characterized by ignorance is the material cause. Consciousness characterized by ignorance thus plays the role of both causes like a spider making its web. The spider is both the instrumental and material causes at the same time.

54. From consciousness characterized by ignorance with its projecting power dominated by *tamas*<sup>31</sup> comes space, from space air, from air fire, from fire water, and from water earth. [This is known] from revealed texts such as: “From this very Self space is born,” (Taitt. U., 2.1.1).

तेषु जाड्याधिक्यदर्शनात्तमःप्राधान्यं तत्कारणस्य । तदानीं सत्त्वरजस्त-  
मांसि कारणगुणप्रक्रमेण तेष्वकाशादिषूत्पद्यन्ते । इमान्येव सूक्ष्मभूतानि  
तन्मात्राण्यपञ्चीकृतानि वोच्यन्ते ॥ ५५ ॥

55. Because of observing greater dullness in them [the five elements], there is a predominance of *tamas* in their cause. At that time *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas* are produced in those elements, space, etc., by the influence of the qualities of their cause. These [the five elements] are called the subtle elements, the *tanmātra*,<sup>32</sup> and the uncombined elements.

एतेभ्यः सूक्ष्मशरीराणि स्थूलभूतानि चोत्पद्यन्ते ॥ ५६ ॥

56. From these are produced the subtle bodies and the gross elements.

### 1.2.10 The Subtle Bodies

सूक्ष्मशरीराणि सप्तदशावयवानि लिङ्गशरीराणि ॥ ५७ ॥

57. Subtle bodies, also known as *liṅga-śarīra* [prototypical bodies], have seventeen constituents.

अवयवास्तु ज्ञानेन्द्रियपञ्चकं बुद्धिमनसी कर्मेन्द्रियपञ्चकं वायुपञ्चकं चे-  
ति ॥ ५८ ॥

<sup>31</sup>The third of the three *guṇa* that influence the material creation. It is represented by darkness and inertia.

<sup>32</sup>The *tanmātra* are pure, generalized sense objects. For instance, fire here is the pure object of the sense of sight without being a specific fire with specific characteristics. *Tanmātra* means “that only,” the pure object of one of the senses. Space supports sound, the object of the ear, air touch, the object of the sense of touch, fire sight, the object of the sense of sight, water flavor, the object of the sense of taste, and earth aroma the object of the sense of smell. They are also called the subtle elements and uncombined elements. As we shall see, only after they are combined do they become the gross elements, the constituents of specific objects.



58. The constituents are the five knowledge senses, the intellect, the mind, the five action senses, and the five vital breaths.

ज्ञानेन्द्रियाणि श्रोत्रत्वक्चक्षुर्जिह्वाघ्राणाख्यानि ॥ ५९ ॥

59. The knowledge senses<sup>33</sup> are known as the sense of hearing, the sense of touch, the sense of sight, the sense of taste, and the sense of smell.

एतान्याकाशादीनां सात्त्विकांशेभ्यो व्यस्तेभ्यः पृथक्क्रमेणोत्पद्यन्ते ॥ ६० ॥

60. These [knowledge senses] are produced separately in order from the distinct *sattva* portions of space, and so forth.<sup>34</sup>

बुद्धिर्नाम निश्चयात्मिकान्तःकरणवृत्तिः ॥ ६१ ॥

61. Intellect is an operation of the internal organ that consists of arriving at certainty.

मनो नाम सङ्कल्पविकल्पात्मिकान्तःकरणवृत्तिः ॥ ६२ ॥

62. The mind is an operation of the internal organ that consists of decision and indecision.<sup>35</sup>

अनयोरेव चित्ताहङ्कारयोरन्तर्भावः ॥ ६३ ॥

63. The theoretical mind and the ego are included in those two [the intellect and the mind].

अनुसन्धानात्मिकान्तःकरणवृत्तिश्चित्तम् ॥ ६४ ॥

64. The theoretical mind is the operation of the internal organ that consists of inquiry.<sup>36</sup>

अभिमानात्मिकान्तःकरणवृत्तिरहङ्कारः ॥ ६५ ॥

<sup>33</sup>A knowledge sense is a sense that produces a “knowledge” or awareness.

<sup>34</sup>Each of the knowledge senses corresponds to one of the subtle elements and they are in the order of their corresponding element. Thus hearing corresponds to space which is the object of its knowledge and so forth.

<sup>35</sup>One commentator, Nṛsiṃha Sarasvatī, characterizes the mind as that operation of the internal organ that consists of doubt, providing as an example: “Am I consciousness or body?” Another, Rāma Tīrtha Yati, says that decision (*saṅkalpa*) is the distinguishing of objects and indecision (*vikalpa*) is the confusing of objects.

<sup>36</sup>Nṛsiṃha Sarasvatī says this mental operation consists of memory or recollection.

65. The ego is the operation of the internal organ that consists of self-conceit.

एते पुनराकाशादिगतसात्त्विकांशेभ्यो मिलितेभ्य उत्पद्यन्ते । एतेषां प्रकाशात्मकत्वात् सात्त्विकांशकार्यत्वम् ॥ ६६ ॥

66. These again are produced from the combined *sattva* portions of space, etc. Because these are characterized by illumination, they are effects of the *sattva* portions.

इयं बुद्धिज्ञानेन्द्रियैः सहिता विज्ञानमयकोशो भवति । अयं कर्तृत्व-भोक्तृत्वसुखित्वदुःखित्वाद्यभिमानित्वेनेहलोकपरलोकगामी व्यावहारिको जीव इत्युच्यते ॥ ६७ ॥

67. This intellect along with the knowledge senses is the wrapping of intellect (*vijñānamaya-kośa*). This [wrapping] by conceiving of itself as an agent, as an enjoyer, as happy, as sad, and so forth moves through this world and the next and is known as the empirical living being (*jīva*).

मनस्तु ज्ञानेन्द्रियैः सहितं सन्मनोमयकोशो भवति ॥ ६८ ॥

68. The mind along with the knowledge senses is the wrapping of mind (*manomaya-kośa*).

कर्मेन्द्रियाणि वाक्पाणिपादपायूपस्थाख्यानि ॥ ६९ ॥

69. The action senses are known as the organs of speech, the hands, the feet, the anus, and the genitals.

एतानि पुनराकाशादीनां रजोंशेभ्यो व्यस्तेभ्यः पृथक्क्रमेणोत्पद्यन्ते ॥ ७० ॥

70. These again are produced in order separately from the discrete *rajas* portions of space, and so forth.

वायवः प्राणापानव्यानोदानसमानाः ।

प्राणो नाम प्राग्गमनवान्नासाग्रस्थानवर्त्ती ।

अपानो नामावाग्गमनवान्पाय्वादस्थानवर्त्ती ।

व्यानो नाम विष्वग्गमनवानखिलशरीरवर्त्ती ।

उदानो नाम कण्ठस्थानीय ऊर्ध्वगमनवानुत्क्रमणवायुः ।

समानो नाम शरीरमध्यगताशितपीतान्नादिसमीकरणकरः ।  
समीकरणं तु परिपाककरणं रसरुधिरशुक्रपुरीशादिकरणमिति यावत् ॥  
७१ ॥

71. The vital breaths are *prāṇa*, *apāna*, *vyāna*, *udāna*, and *samāna*. *Prāṇa* [is the breath that] moves forward and is situated in the tip of the nose. *Apāna* moves downward and is situated in the anus, etc. *Vyāna* moves in all directions and is situated throughout the body. *Udāna*, located in the throat, moves upward and is the breath that erupts out [of the body].<sup>37</sup> *Samāna* causes the mixing together of foods eaten and drunken in the middle of the body. That mixing together is digestion which is the production of juices, blood, semen, stool, etc.

केचित्तु नागकूर्मकृकरदेवदत्तधनञ्जयाख्याः पञ्चान्ये वायवः सन्तीत्या-  
हः । तत्र नाग उद्गिरणकरः । कूर्म उन्मीलनकरः । कृकरः क्षुधाकरः ।  
देवदत्तो जृम्भनकरः । धनञ्जयः पोषणकरः । एतेषां प्राणादिष्वन्तर्भावा-  
त्प्राणादयः पञ्चैवेति केचित् ॥ ७२ ॥

72. Some say that there are five other vital breaths known as snake (*nāga*), turtle (*kūrma*), partridge (*kṛkara*), god-given (*devadatta*), and winner-of-riches (*dhanañjaya*). Among them, snake causes regurgitation, turtle causes openings [of the eyes, etc], partridge causes hunger, god-given causes yawning, and winner-of wealth causes nourishment. Others say that because these are included in *prāṇa*, and the others, there are only the five vital breaths, headed by *prāṇa*.

एतत्प्राणादिपञ्चकमाकाशादिगतरजोशेभ्यो मिलितेभ्य उत्पद्यते ॥ ७३ ॥

73. These five headed by *prāṇa* are produced from the conjoined *rajas* portions present in space, etc.

इदं प्राणादिपञ्चकं कर्मेन्द्रियैः सहितं सत्प्राणमयकोशो भवति । अस्य  
क्रियात्मकत्वेन रजोशकार्यत्वम् ॥ ७४ ॥

74. This pentad of vital breaths along with the action senses is the animate wrapping (*prāṇamaya-kośa*). Because it is characterized by action, it is the effect of the *rajas* portion.

<sup>37</sup>This refers to belching or burping.

एतेषु कोशेषु मध्ये विज्ञानमयो ज्ञानशक्तिमान् कर्तृरूपः । मनोमय इच्छाशक्तिमान् करणरूपः । प्राणमयः क्रियाशक्तिमान् कार्यरूपः । योग्यत्वादेवमेतेषां विभाग इति वर्णयन्ति ॥ ७५ ॥

75. Among these wrappings, the wrapping of intellect possesses the power of knowing and has the form of the agent [the actor]. The wrapping of mind possesses the power of willing and has the form of the instrument. The animate wrapping has the power of acting and has the form of the effect. [The wise] describe their division in such a way as according to capacity.<sup>38</sup>

एतत्कोशत्रयं मिलितं सत्सूक्ष्मशरीरमित्युच्यते ॥ ७६ ॥

76. This triad of wrappings together are said to be the subtle body.

अत्राप्यखिलसूक्ष्मशरीरमेकबुद्धिविषयतया वनवज्जलाशयवद्वा समष्टि-  
रनेकबुद्धिविषयतया वृक्षवज्जलवद्वा व्यष्टिरपि भवति ॥ ७७ ॥

77. Here, too, the entire subtle body, as the object of a single [universal] intellect, is collective like the forest or reservoir and, as the object of many intellects, is distributive like the trees or waters.

एतत्समष्ट्युपहितं चैतन्यं सूत्रात्मा हिरण्यगर्भः प्राण इत्युच्यते सर्वत्रा-  
नुस्यूतत्वाज्ज्ञानेच्छाक्रियाशक्तिमदपञ्चीकृतपञ्चमहाभूताभिमानित्वाच्च ।  
अस्यैषा समष्टिः स्थूलप्रपञ्चापेक्षया सूक्ष्मत्वात्सूक्ष्मशरीरं विज्ञानमया-  
दिकोशत्रयं जाग्रद्वासनामयत्वात्स्वप्नोऽतएव स्थूलप्रपञ्चलयस्थानमिति  
चोच्यते ॥ ७८ ॥

78. Consciousness characterized by this collective [ignorance] is called the Thread Self (Sūtrātmā), the Golden Embryo (Hiraṇyagarbha), and the Vital Breath (Prāṇa) because [in the first case] of being threaded through everything and [in the second and third cases] because of considering itself to be among the five, great, uncombined elements<sup>39</sup> [yet] possessed of the powers of knowing, willing, and acting. Its collective ignorance, being subtler than the gross manifestation, is called the subtle body, which is the triad of wrappings headed by the wrapping of intellect; and, because it

<sup>38</sup>These three wrappings thus represent the three powers often recognized in Indic philosophy: the powers of knowing, willing, and acting.

<sup>39</sup>That is, the five subtle elements mentioned before: space, air, fire, water, and earth.

consists of the impressions of the waking state, it is called dream<sup>40</sup> and, therefore, is the place of the dissolution of the gross manifestation.<sup>41</sup>

एतद्विष्युपहितं चैतन्यं तैजसो भवति तेजोमयान्तःकरणोपहितत्वात् ॥  
७९ ॥

79. Consciousness characterized by distributive ignorance is the Effulgent (Taijasa) because it is characterized by an internal organ made of light.

अस्यापीयं व्यष्टिः स्थूलशरीरापेक्षया सूक्ष्मत्वादिति हेतोरेव सूक्ष्मशरीरं विज्ञानमयादिकोशत्रयं जाग्रद्व्यासनामयत्वात्स्वप्नोऽतएव स्थूलशरीरलयस्थानमिति चोच्यते ॥ ८० ॥

80. Its distributive ignorance [because of] being subtler than the gross body is called the subtle body, which is the triad of wrappings headed by the wrapping of intellect; and, because it consists of the impressions of the waking state, it is also called dream and, therefore, is the place of the dissolution of the gross body.

एतौ सूत्रात्मतैजसौ तदानीं सूक्ष्मभिर्मनोवृत्तिभिः सूक्ष्मविषयाननुभवतः प्रविविक्तभुक् तैजस इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥ ८१ ॥

81. These two, Thread Self and Effulgent, then [in the state of dream] perceive subtle objects by means of the subtle operations of the internal organ. [This is known] from revealed texts like: "The Effulgent is the enjoyer of subtle objects" (Māṇḍ. U., 4).

अत्रापि समष्टिव्यष्ट्योस्तदुपहितसूत्रात्मतैजस्योश्च वनवृक्षवत्तदवच्छिन्नाकाशवच्च जलाशयजलवत्तद्गतप्रतिबिम्बाकाशवच्चाभेदः । एवं सूक्ष्मशरीरोत्पत्तिः ॥ ८२ ॥

<sup>40</sup>Dreams are thought to be based on the latent impressions left by experiences undergone in the waking state, either in this life or in other lives. The subtle body preserves those experiences and they are sometimes reexperienced in dream or remembered in waking life or they become the foundation of aesthetic experience.

<sup>41</sup>The gross manifestation or physical universe dissolves into this subtle body at the time of the universal dissolution. According to Hindu cosmology, the physical world undergoes periodic destructions and periods of non-manifestation. Those periods are likened to the dreaming sleep of the Lord. When he awakens the world is created again. Similarly, on the microcosmic level when a person sleeps and dreams the external world is dissolved temporarily. Only the subtle body is involved in dreaming.

82. Here, too, the collective and distributive ignorances are non-different like the forest and its trees or the reservoir and its waters, and Thread Self and Effulgent are non-different like the spaces delimited by those [the forest and its trees] or like the reflections of the sky in those [the reservoir and its waters]. Thus, [has been described] the production of the subtle body [by the projecting power of ignorance].

### 1.2.11 The Gross Elements

स्थूलभूतानि तु पञ्चीकृतानि । पञ्चीकरणं त्वाकाशादिपञ्चस्वेकैकं द्विधा  
समं विभज्य तेषु दशसु भागेषु मध्ये प्राथमिकान्पञ्चभागान्प्रत्येकं चतु-  
र्धा समं विभज्य तेषां चतुर्णां भागानां स्वस्वद्वितीयार्धभागं परित्यज्य  
भागान्तरेषु संयोजनम् । तदुक्तम्

द्विधा विधाय चैकैकं  
चतुर्धा प्रथमं पुनः ।  
स्वस्वेतरद्वितीयांशैर्  
योजनात्पञ्च पञ्च ते ॥ इति ॥ ८३ ॥

83. The gross elements are combined [lit., made fivefold]. Combination is dividing each of the five subtle elements, space and so forth, into two equal halves, taking the first of [each of] those halves and dividing it into four equal parts, and, skipping the element's own second half, combining those four parts to the second halves of the other elements. This is stated:

Dividing each one into two,  
And the first [of each] fourfold again,  
From joining with the seconds of others  
They each become fivefold. (*Pañcadaśī*, 1.27)<sup>42</sup>

<sup>42</sup>Each element is made fivefold because one part of each of the four other elements is combined with it. Thus, the gross element space is one half space, one eighth air, one eighth fire, one eighth water, and one eighth earth, making it consist of five parts. This consisting of five parts is what I am translating as "combination."

अस्याप्रामाण्यं नाशङ्कनीयं त्रिवृत्करणश्रुतेः पञ्चीकरणस्याप्युपलक्षण-  
त्वात् ॥ ८४ ॥

84. One should not suspect a lack of evidence for this, because [fivefold] combination is implied by the revealed text: “making threefold”.<sup>43</sup>

पञ्चानां पञ्चात्मकत्वे समानेऽपि तेषु च वैशेष्यात्तु तद्वादस्तद्वाद इति  
न्यायेनाकाशादिव्यपदेशः सम्भवति ॥ ८५ ॥

85. Though in the matter of being fivefold the five [gross elements] are the same, the terms “space,” etc. can be applied to them by the logic: “because of its distinctive nature, something is spoken of as this or that” (Br. sū., 2.4.22).<sup>44</sup>

### 1.2.12 The Gross Sense Objects

तदानीमाकाशे शब्दोऽभिव्यज्यते वायौ शब्दस्पर्शवग्नौ शब्दस्पर्शरूपा-  
णि जले शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसाः पृथिव्यां शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धाश्च ॥ ८६ ॥

86. Then, in space is manifested sound, in air sound and touch, in fire sound, touch, and color, in water sound, touch, color, and flavor, in earth sound, touch, color, flavor, and fragrance.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>43</sup>The “making threefold” text is: *tāsāṃ trivṛtaṃ trivṛtamekaikāṃ karavāṇi* (Chānd. U., 6.3.2). “Let me make each one of them threefold.” This making threefold implies for the Advaitin the making fivefold of the gross elements in the present context. Even though the numbers do not match, the concept of combination is supported by this passage. There is probably no direct support for fivefold combination in the Upaniṣads. This statement anticipates an opponent’s objection.

<sup>44</sup>Each of the elements is fivefold by containing parts of the other elements in them. In that respect they are the same. If that is so, why do we call one space and another air. The element space is half space and one eighth of each of the other elements. The space portion gives it its distinctiveness and thus, following the teaching of the *sūtra* from the *Brahma-sūtra*, it can be called space rather than air or one of the other elements.

<sup>45</sup>This differs from the view of the elements in the school of Indian logic in which each of the elements has its own quality not shared with any of the others. Thus, space has sound, air has touch, fire has color, water has taste, and earth has fragrance.

### 1.2.13 The Phenomenal World

एतेभ्यः पञ्चीकृतेभ्यो भूतेभ्यो भूर्भुवःस्वर्महर्जनस्तपःसत्यमित्येतन्ना-  
मकानामुपर्युपरि विद्यमानामतलवितलसुतलरसातलतलातलमहातल-  
पातालनामकानामधोऽधो विद्यमानां लोकानां ब्रह्माण्डस्य तदन्तर्गतच-  
तुर्विधस्थूलशरीराणां तदुचितानामन्नपानादीनां चोत्पत्तिर्भवति ॥ ८७ ॥

87. From these combined elements arise the worlds named Bhūs, Bhu-vas, Svas, Mahas, Janas, Tapas, and Satya that exist higher and higher [in the cosmos]; the worlds named Atala, Vitala, Sutala, Rasātala, Talātala, Mahātala, Pātāla that exist lower and lower [in the cosmos];<sup>46</sup> the cosmic egg;<sup>47</sup> the four types of gross bodies in it; and the food, drink and so forth suitable for those [bodies].

### 1.2.14 Four Types of Gross Bodies

चतुर्विधस्थूलशरीराणि तु जरायुजाण्डजस्वेदजोद्भिज्जाख्यानि । जरा-  
युजानि जरायुभ्यो जातानि मनुष्यपञ्चादीनि । अण्डजान्यण्डेभ्यो जा-  
तानि पक्षिपन्नगादीनि । स्वेदजानि स्वेदेभ्यो जातानि यूकामशकादीनि ।  
उद्भिज्जानि भूमिमुद्भिद्य जातानि लतावृक्षादीनि ॥ ८८ ॥

88. The four types of gross bodies are the placenta-born, the egg-born, the sweat-born, and the sprout-born. The placenta-born are humans, animals, and so forth that are born from the placenta. The egg-born are those born from eggs like birds, snakes, and so forth. The sweat-born are those born from sweat [water] like lice, mosquitos, and so forth. The sprout-born are those born by splitting the ground like vines, trees and so forth.

<sup>46</sup>The seven upper worlds and the seven lower worlds make up the fourteen-tiered phenomenal universe. The upper worlds are in ascending order and represent the various heavens of the gods and nearly perfected beings and the lower worlds, in descending order, are the abodes of various *asura*, demonic beings more powerful than human beings, but less powerful than the gods. The world called Bhūs, which is in the middle of the tiers, is the world of humans, this earth.

<sup>47</sup>The cosmic egg (*brahmāṇḍa*) is this universe envisioned as an egg. According to this cosmology, all that we see and know takes places within the walls of an enormous egg-like structure. For a good presentation of traditional Hindu cosmology see Klostermaier, *A Survey of Hinduism*, Chapter 7.



अत्रापि चतुर्विधसकलस्थूलशरीरमेकानेकबुद्धिविषयतया वनवज्जला-  
शयवद्वा समष्टिर्वृक्षवज्जलवद्वा व्यष्टिरपि भवति । एतत्समष्ट्युपहितं  
चैतन्यं वैश्वानरो विराडिति चोच्यते सर्वनराभिमानित्वाद्विविधं रा-  
जमानत्वाच्च । अस्यैषा समष्टिः स्थूलशरीरमन्नविकारत्वादन्नमयकोशः  
स्थूलभोगायतनत्वाच्च स्थूलशरीरं जाग्रदिति चोच्यते ॥ ८९ ॥

89. Here, too, this fourfold gross body, depending on whether it is the object of a single awareness or of many awarenesses, is collective like a forest or reservoir or distributive like trees or waters. Consciousness characterized by this collective body is the Universal Being (Vaiśvānara) and the Splendid (Virāj) because it identifies with all beings and because it appears variously [in various forms].<sup>48</sup> The collective body of this one is the gross body. Because it is a transformation of food, it is called the wrapping of food (*annamaya-kośa*); because of being the seat of gross enjoyment, it is called the gross body and the waking state.

### 1.2.15 The Waking State

एतद्व्यष्ट्युपहितं चैतन्यं विश्व इत्युच्यते सूक्ष्मशरीराभिमानमपरित्यज्य  
स्थूलशरीरादिप्रविष्टत्वात् । अस्याप्येषा व्यष्टिः स्थूलशरीरमन्नविकार-  
त्वादेव हेतोरन्नमयकोशः स्थूलभोगायतनत्वाज्जाग्रदिति चोच्यते । त-  
दानीमेतौ विश्ववैश्वानरौ दिग्वातार्कवरुणाश्विभिः क्रमान्नियन्त्रितेन श्रो-  
त्रादीन्द्रियपञ्चकेन क्रमाच्छब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धानग्नीन्द्रोपेन्द्रयमप्रजाप-  
तिभिः क्रमान्नियन्त्रितेन वागादीन्द्रियपञ्चकेन क्रमाद्वचनादानगमनवि-  
सर्गानन्दांश्चन्द्रचतुर्मुखशङ्कराच्युतैः क्रमान्नियन्त्रितेन मनोबुद्ध्यहङ्कारचि-  
त्ताख्येनान्तरिन्द्रियचतुष्केण क्रमात्सङ्कल्पनिश्चयाहङ्कार्यचैत्तांश्च सर्वाने-  
तान् स्थूलविषयाननुभवतो जागरितस्थानो बहिःप्रज्ञ इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥  
९० ॥

<sup>48</sup>These are attempts to provide an etymology for the Upaniṣadic names Vaiśvānara and Virāj. Vaiśvānara is viewed as a combination of the words *viśva* (all) and *nara* (man) and might be translated as All-man, Everyman, or Universal Man. It represents all embodied beings (not just humans) as parts of a universal embodied being. Virāj is understood as *vividha* (various) and *rājamāna* (shining or existing) and so means “shining or existing variously.” It stands for the recognition that this universal being manifests in diverse physical forms.

90. Consciousness characterized by this distributive gross body is called Everyone (Viśva) because, without giving up its identification with the subtle body it has entered a gross body.<sup>49</sup> This distributive gross body is called the wrapping of food because it is a transformation of food and the waking state because it is the place of gross enjoyment. Then [in that waking state] these two, Everyone and Universal Being, experience all the gross sense objects, namely sound, touch, color, flavor, and aroma, with their five [knowledge] senses, the ear, the skin, the eye, the tongue, and the nose which are controlled by [the gods] Dik, Vāta, Sūrya, Varuṇa and the two Aśvins respectively;<sup>50</sup> [these two, Viśva and Vaiśvānara, experience] speaking, grasping, movement, excreting, and pleasure with their five action senses speech [i.e., the mouth and throat], hands, feet, anus, and genitals which senses are controlled by Agni, Indra, Upendra, Yama, and Prajāpati respectively;<sup>51</sup> [these two, Viśva and Vaiśvānara, experience]

<sup>49</sup>This is an attempt to explain the use of the word *viśva* for the living being by relating it to the root *viś* "to enter." Viśva means "universe," or, as a pronoun, it means "all" or "everyone." On the basis of its use in some passages of the Upaniṣads, it comes to mean the living being.

<sup>50</sup>These are the names of gods believed to control sense activity. Dik means space or direction which is connected with the functioning of the ear because sound is thought to be connected to space as its quality. Vāta is the wind god and is connected with the sense of touch or the skin because, though it is formless and invisible, wind is registered by the feeling it produces on the skin. Sūrya is the sun god and his connection with the eye and the sense of sight is obvious. Varuṇa, the ancient god of waters and justice, is connected with the sense of taste located in the tongue, which is actuated by the tongue's moisture. The Aśvins are harder to place in this context. The Aśvins (*aśvin* literally means "horseman") are twins and appear in the mythology as the physicians of the gods. Their twoness might explain their association with the nose which has two nostrils. As physicians perhaps they are associated with the *prāṇa* or vital breath (in its various forms thought to be behind digestion and circulation), disturbances in which cause physical disorders. One would expect a god connected with the earth here, for earth adds the unique quality of smell to the physical world and the sense of smell is located in the nose. I am unaware of an earthly association for the Aśvins, though, here again their being physicians might connect them with medicinal herbs and therefore with the earth.

<sup>51</sup>Again these are names of gods. Agni, the god of fire and sacrifice, is often referred to as the mouth of the gods because offerings are poured or placed in the sacrificial fire. Agni devours the offerings and carries them to the other gods in the heavens. Indra's connection with the hands is probably through his skill in combat and war. He is the Vedic cosmic power, hero and warrior god. Upendra is the name of the dwarf incarnation of Viṣṇu whose three strides encompassed all the universe. He is thus connected with movement and the feet. Yama, the god of death, is interestingly connected with

resolution, certainty, egoism and reflection by their four internal organs, the mind, intellect, ego, and reflective mind, which organs are controlled by Candra, Brahmā, Śaṅkara, and Acyuta respectively.<sup>52</sup> [This is known] from revealed texts like: “The place of the awakened is external awareness” (Māṇḍ. U., 3).

अत्राप्यनयोः स्थूलव्यष्टिसमष्ट्योस्तदुपहितयोर्विश्ववैश्वानरयोश्च वृक्षवन-  
वत्तदवच्छिन्नाकाशवच्च जलजलाशयवत्तद्गतप्रतिबिम्बाकाशवच्च वा पू-  
र्ववदभेदः ॥ ९१ ॥

91. Here, too, those two gross, distributive and collective [bodies] and the Everyone and Universal Being that are [consciousness] characterized by those [bodies] are, like before, not different, just like the forest and its trees and the spaces delimited by them or like the reservoir and its waters and the space [sky] reflected in them.

एवं पञ्चीकृतपञ्चभूतेभ्यः स्थूलप्रपञ्चोत्पत्तिः ॥ ९२ ॥

92. Thus [has been described] the creation of the gross manifestation from the five combined elements.

### 1.2.16 The Greater Manifestation

एतेषां स्थूलसूक्ष्मकारणशरीरप्रपञ्चानामपि समष्टिरेको महान् प्रपञ्चो  
भवति यथाऽवान्तरवनानां समष्टिरेकं महद्वनं भवति यथा वाऽवान्तर-  
जलाशयानां समष्टिरेको महान् जलाशयः । एतदुपहितं विश्ववैश्वानरा-

excretion and the anus. Finally, Prajāpati, the procreator of all beings is connected quite appropriately with the genitals. In this way most of the major Vedic and mythic gods, cosmic forces all, are incorporated into the microcosmic world of the physical body.

<sup>52</sup>Candra is the moon god and is connected with the mind which is the operation of the internal organ involved with decision and indecision. Brahmā, the creator god and revealer of the Vedas, is connected with the intellect which is the operation of the internal organ that produces certainty. Śaṅkara or Śiva represents pure I-consciousness and is connected with the ego operation of the internal organ. Acyuta or Viṣṇu, the maintainer, is connected with the reflective mind which is that operation of the internal organ that produces inquiry, recollection, or imagination. Acyuta means “undiminishing” or “unfallen.”

दीश्वरपर्यन्तं चैतन्यमप्यवान्तरवनावच्छिन्नाकाशवदवान्तरजलाशयगतप्रतिबिम्बाकाशवच्चैकमेव ॥ ९३ ॥

93. The collective of these manifestations of the gross, subtle, and causal bodies is also one super manifestation, just as the collective of lesser forests is one great forest or the collective of lesser reservoirs is one great reservoir. Consciousness, too, characterized by those [manifestations] from Everyone and Universal Being up to the Lord, is one only, like the space delimited by lesser forests and the space [sky] reflected in lesser reservoirs.

आभ्यां महाप्रपञ्चतदुपहितचैतन्याभ्यां तप्तायःपिण्डवदविविक्तं सद्नुपहितं चैतन्यं सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म इति महावाक्यस्य वाच्यं भवति । विविक्तं सल्लक्ष्यमपि भवति ॥ ९४ ॥

94. Uncharacterized consciousness, when not differentiated from that super manifestation and consciousness characterized by it, is, like a lump of heated iron [in which fire is not differentiated from the iron], the direct meaning of the great pronouncement: “all this indeed is Brahman” (Chānd. U., 3.14.1). When differentiated from those two it is the indirect meaning [of that pronouncement] also.

एवं वस्तुन्यवस्तुत्वारोप अध्यारोपः सामान्येन प्रदर्शितः ॥ ९५ ॥

95. Thus, superimposition, which is the imposition of what is not some thing onto that thing, has been illustrated in general terms.

इदानीं प्रत्यगात्मनीदमिदमयमयमारोपयतीति विशेषत उच्यते ॥ ९६ ॥

96. Now, how this and that person superimposes this and that on the inner self will be described in specific terms.<sup>53</sup>

### 1.2.17 The Son as Self

तत्र चातिप्राकृतस्तु आत्मा वै जायते पुत्र इत्यादिश्रुतेः स्वस्मिनिव स्वपुत्रेऽपि प्रेमदर्शनात्पुत्रे पुष्टे नष्टे चाहमेव पुष्टो नष्टश्चेत्याद्यनुभवाच्च पुत्र आत्मेति वदति ॥ ९७ ॥

<sup>53</sup>This might be paraphrased as: “Now, how various people impose various traits on the inner Self will be described in detail.”

97. And on this subject the extreme materialist<sup>54</sup> says “the son is my Self,” [first] because of the revealed text: “the Self indeed is born the son;” [second] because of seeing that one loves one’s son like oneself, and [third] because of the experience: “when my son flourishes or is destroyed, I flourish or am destroyed.”

### 1.2.18 The Gross Body as Self

चार्वाकस्तु स वा एष पुरुषोऽन्नरसमय इत्यादिश्रुतेः प्रदीप्तगृहात्स्वपुत्रं परित्यज्यापि स्वस्य निर्गमनदर्शनात्स्थूलोऽहं कृशोऽहमित्याद्यनुभवाच्च स्थूलशरीरमात्मेति वदति ॥ ९८ ॥

98. Another type of materialist thinker [Cārvāka] says the gross body is the Self because of the revealed text: “Or, it is this very person made of the essence of food” (Tait. U., 2.1.1), because of seeing someone flee from a burning house leaving even one’s own son behind, and because of the experience: “I am fat. I am thin.”<sup>55</sup>

### 1.2.19 The Senses as Self

अपरश्चार्वाकस्ते ह प्राणाः प्रजापतिं पितरमेत्योचुरित्यादिश्रुतेरिन्द्रियाणामभावे शरीरचलनाभावात्काणोऽहं वदिरोऽहमित्याद्यनुभवाम्बे-

<sup>54</sup>The extreme materialist referred to here is a kind of materialistic philosopher called Cārvāka or Lokāyatika. Three other types of Cārvāka, higher types in the opinion of the author, are the focus of the three following sections of the text. Cārvāka may mean the follower of an ancient thinker named Carvāka, whose actual existence some doubt, or, by another interpretation, it may mean “charming speaker” from *cāru-vāk*. Lokāyatika means “of the people” and refers to the way of thinking of ordinary or common people. Not many of the original works of this school of thought have survived, but its thought is referred to and characterized by writers from the other schools of Indian thought on many occasions. One of the major characteristics of the Cārvāka school of thought is the denial of the authority of the Veda and related scriptures. The quotes from revealed scripture that are given here and in the following sections in support of the contentions of the materialist school are for the benefit of their opponents who accept the authority of the Veda, not for the Cārvāka who arrive at their position through direct perception alone and accept no other, higher authority.

<sup>55</sup>This materialistic position is considered a little more “enlightened.”

न्द्रियाण्यात्मेति वदति ॥ ९९ ॥

99. Another materialist says the senses are the Self because of the revealed text: “They, the vital breaths, approached Prajāpati, the father, and spoke ...” (Chānd. U., 5.1.7),<sup>56</sup> because in the absence of the senses the body does not move, and because of the experiences: “I am blind. I am deaf.”<sup>57</sup>

### 1.2.20 The Vital Breath as Self

अन्यस्तु चार्वाकोऽन्योऽन्तर आत्मा प्राणमय इत्यादिश्रुतेः प्राणाभाव इन्द्रियादिचलनायोगादहमशनायावानहं पिपासावानित्याद्यनुभवाच्च प्राण आत्मेति वदति ॥ १०० ॥

100. Yet another materialist says that vital breath is the Self because of the revealed text: “Another, [deeper] inside, is the Self consisting of the vital breath” (Tait. U., 2.2.1), because, in the absence of vital breath, the senses and the rest are unable to act, and because of the experiences: “I am hungry. I am thirsty.”<sup>58</sup>

<sup>56</sup>The “vital breaths” here in the quote from the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* mean the senses. This is understood from the context of the passage in which the breaths (i.e. senses) ask Prajāpati, the lord of creatures, which of them is the most important. Their asking suggests that they are seats of consciousness in the body and that without them, as in deep sleep or a faint, the body becomes unconscious. We are moving in this set of paragraphs gradually from grosser to subtler conceptions of the Self.

<sup>57</sup>This statement would seem to be contradict the claim that the senses are the Self. To say “I am blind” means “I am without sight”, “I am deaf” means “I am without hearing”. If the “I” represents the Self in those sentences, the Self is different from sight or hearing because the “I” persists when sight and hearing does not. One might suggest that what is meant here is that the Self is identical with all the senses together, not any one of them. If all the senses depart from the body, the body becomes unconscious, which is to say absent of Self. We are now moving through the various wrappings as possible candidates for the Self. See paras. 67-75 for the discussion of the wrappings.

<sup>58</sup>The desire for food and drink are well known characteristics of the vital breath, says one of the commentators, because without food and water the vital breath departs.

### 1.2.21 The Mind as Self

इतरस्तु चार्वाकोऽन्योऽन्तर आत्मा मनोमय इत्यादिश्रुतेर्मनसि सुप्ते प्राणादेरभावादहं सङ्कल्पवानहं विकल्पवानित्याद्यनुभवाच्च मन आत्मेति वदति ॥ १०१ ॥

101. A still different materialist says the mind is the Self, because of the revealed text “Another, inside (it), is the Self consisting of mind” (Tait. U., 2.3.1), because when the mind sleeps the vital breath and the others are absent, and because of the experiences: “I am decided. I am undecided.”<sup>59</sup>

### 1.2.22 The Intellect as Self

बौद्धस्त्वन्योऽन्तर आत्मा विज्ञानमय इत्यादिश्रुतेः कर्तुरभावे करणस्य शक्त्यभावादहं कर्ताहं भोक्तेत्याद्यनुभवाच्च बुद्धिरात्मेति वदति ॥ १०२ ॥

102. The Buddhist, however, says the intellect is the Self in accordance with the revealed text: “Another, inside, is the Self consisting of intellect” (Tait. U., 2.4.1), because, in the absence of an agent, the instrument has no power, and because of the experiences “I am the doer. I am the enjoyer.”<sup>60</sup>

### 1.2.23 The Self as Ignorance

प्राभाकरतार्किकौ त्वन्योऽन्तर आत्मानन्दमय इत्यादिश्रुतेः सुषुप्तौ बुद्ध्यादीनामज्ञाने लयदर्शनादहमज्ञोऽहमज्ञानीत्याद्यनुभवाच्चाज्ञानमात्मेति वदतः ॥ १०३ ॥

<sup>59</sup>When the mind sleeps means when a person faints, according to one of the commentators. The senses and the vital breath disappear to return later, an observation that suggests the presence and persistence of something else more stable than they, upon which they depend. That something else is the mind. Decision and indecision are the operations of the internal organ that are called the mind.

<sup>60</sup>The commentators identify this Buddhist philosopher as a Vijñānavādin or a member of the Yogācāra school. This is the “consciousness-only” school of Buddhist philosophy associated with Asaṅga (4th cent. C.E.), which holds that only consciousness is real.

<sup>61</sup>In Hiriyaṇṇa’s version of the text this is *aham jñānī*, “I possess knowledge,” but in Medhācāitanyā’s reading it is *aham ajñānī*, “I am without knowledge.” Either reading

103. The follower of Prabhākara<sup>62</sup> and the Logician<sup>63</sup> say that insentience is the Self because of the revealed text: “Another, inside, is the Self consisting of joy” (Tait. U., 2.5.1), because intellect and the rest are seen to disappear into insentience [in deep sleep], and because of the experiences: “I am ignorant; I am without knowledge.”

### 1.2.24 The Self as Awareness and Ignorance

भाट्टस्तु प्रज्ञानघन एवानन्दमय इत्यादिश्रुतेः सुषुप्तौ प्रकाशाप्रकाशस-  
द्भावान्मामहं न जानामीत्याद्यनुभवाच्चाज्ञानोपहितं चैतन्यमात्मेति व-  
दति ॥ १०४ ॥

104. The follower of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa,<sup>64</sup> however, says the Self is consciousness characterized by ignorance because of the revealed text: “The Self is condensed consciousness and consists of joy” (Māṇḍ. U., 5), because of the coexistence of consciousness and unconsciousness [joy] in deep sleep, and because of the experience: “I do not know myself.”

### 1.2.25 The Self as Emptiness

अपरो बौद्धोऽसदेवेदमग्र आसीदित्यादिश्रुतेः सुषुप्तौ सर्वाभावादहं सु-  
षुप्तौ नासमित्युत्थितस्य स्वाभावपरामर्शविषयानुभवाच्च शून्यमात्मेति

seems appropriate here. Hiriyanna’s reading suggests that the Self possesses knowledge, but is not itself knowledge, and Medhācāitanyā’s reading suggests that the Self can be without knowledge.

<sup>62</sup>Prabhākara Miśra (7th cent. C.E.) is the founder of a sub-school of Mīmāṃsā philosophy. The Mīmāṃsā school is concerned with the proper interpretation of Vedic texts and with philosophical assumptions upon which Vedic ritual is based.

<sup>63</sup>The school of Indian Logic or Nyāya is a school of thought that takes a realistic view of the world and Self. It is concerned with the conditions for correct inference and the acquisition of correct knowledge of reality. Both of the schools in this paragraph, Prabhākara and Nyāya, understand knowledge to be a quality of the Self, which implies that the Self can be separated from knowledge or awareness, and therefore is in essence without knowledge. That is the sense in which the Self is said to be insentient.

<sup>64</sup>Kumārila Bhaṭṭa (8th cent. C.E.) is the founder of another sub-school of the Mīmāṃsā school of orthodox Hindu philosophy. They differ from the Prabhākara sub-school by taking the Self to be both conscious and a substance (i.e. unconscious).



वदति ॥ १०५ ॥

105. Another Buddhist<sup>65</sup> says that the Self is empty because of the revealed text: “Non-existent indeed was this in the beginning” (Chānd. U., 6.2.1), because in deep sleep everything is absent, and because one just risen from sleep experiences the recollection of one’s own non-existence: “In deep sleep, I did not exist.”

एतेषां पुत्रादीनां शून्यपर्यन्तानामनात्मत्वमुच्यते । एतैरतिप्राकृतादि-  
वादिभिरुक्तेषु श्रुतियुक्त्यनुभवाभासेषु पूर्वपूर्वोक्तश्रुतियुक्त्यनुभवाभासाना-  
मुत्तरोत्तरश्रुतियुक्त्यनुभवाभासैरात्मत्वबाधदर्शनात् पुत्रादीनामनात्मत्वं  
स्पष्टमेवेति ॥ १०६ ॥

106. These [theories] beginning from the son up to emptiness are said to be non-Self. That the son and so forth are not the Self is plain because of seeing – in these apparently authoritative texts, arguments, and experiences cited by the contenders beginning with the extreme materialist – the falsification<sup>66</sup> of the earlier texts, arguments, and experiences by the later texts, arguments, and experiences.

किञ्च प्रत्यगस्थूलोऽचक्षुरप्राणोऽमना अकर्ता चैतन्यं चिन्मात्रं सदि-  
त्यादिप्रबलश्रुतिविरोधादस्य पुत्रादिशून्यपर्यन्तस्य जडस्य चैतन्यभा-  
स्यत्वेन घटादिवदनित्यत्वादहं ब्रह्मेतिविद्वदनुभवप्राबल्याच्च तत्तच्छ्रुति-  
युक्त्यनुभवाभासानां बाधितत्वादपि पुत्रादिशून्यपर्यन्तमखिलमनात्मैव ॥  
१०७ ॥

<sup>65</sup>This is the Mādhyamaka Buddhist also known as the Śūnyavādin, those who present the absolute as emptiness (*śūnya*). One of the greatest proponents of this school was the Buddhist philosopher Nāgārjuna (2nd cent. C.E.). It is interesting to note that in the hierarchy of “ways of seeing” represented here by these various schools, the one at the top is that of the Śūnyavāda Buddhist. This means that it is recognized as the closest to the position of the Advaitin. The difference is that for the Buddhist the absolute is emptiness (*śūnyatā*) and for the Advaitin it is uncharacterized consciousness (*anupahita-caitanya*).

<sup>66</sup>This falsification refers to the process Eliot Deutsch calls *subration* in his presentation of Advaita Vedānta philosophy. Something is subrated if it is devalued and falsified by being contradicted by a later experience, such that both cannot be true. Reality for the Advaitin is that which cannot be subrated by anything else. See Eliot Deutsch, *Advaita Vedānta: a philosophical reconstruction* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1969), pp, 15-22.

107. Moreover, this entire group from sons up to emptiness is not the Self because the various apparently authoritative texts, arguments, and experiences [in support of them] are falsified in that [in the case of the texts] they are opposed by more forceful revealed texts [which describe the Self as]: ‘inner’, ‘not gross’, ‘not the eye’, ‘not mind’, ‘not an agent’, ‘consciousness’, ‘consciousness alone’, and ‘being’;<sup>67</sup> [they are falsified in the case of argument in that] this insentient group from sons up to emptiness is itself illuminated by consciousness and thus is impermanent like pots and so forth;<sup>68</sup> and [they are falsified in the case of experience in that] the experience of the learned, “I am Brahman,” is of greater force.<sup>69</sup>

अतस्तत्तद्भासकं नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तसत्यस्वभावं प्रत्यक्चैतन्यमेवात्मत-  
त्त्वमिति वेदान्तविदनुभवः । एवमध्यारोपः ॥ १०८ ॥

108. Therefore, that which illuminates all those things, the internal consciousness, whose nature is eternal, pure, awakened, liberated, and true, is the Self. Such is the experience of the knowers of Vedānta. Thus [has been explained] superimposition.

### 1.3 The Disabusing

अपवादो नाम रज्जुविवर्तस्य सर्पस्य रज्जुमात्रत्ववद्वस्तुविवर्तस्याव-  
स्तुनोऽज्ञानादेः प्रपञ्चस्य वस्तुमात्रत्वम् । तदुक्तम्

सतत्त्वतोऽन्यथाप्रथा विकार इत्युदाहृतः ।

अतत्त्वतोऽन्यथाप्रथा विवर्त इत्युदाहृतः ॥ १०९ ॥

<sup>67</sup>In this list, each of the revealed texts cited earlier in support of the various positions on the nature of the Self is contradicted. Each item in the list is supported by a “more powerful” revealed text than the one cited earlier. “Inner” contradicts the Self as son (which is outer); “not gross” contradicts the Self as body, and so forth.

<sup>68</sup>This argument or syllogism contradicts the arguments of the previous views. The argument is that the various candidates for Selfhood are not conscious because they are themselves objects of consciousness. As objects of consciousness they are *jaḍa*, dead or unconscious, like pots and other objects, and also like pots and other objects they are not eternal.

<sup>69</sup>This experience contradicts and sublates the other experiences cited by the proponents of the other views.

109. The disabusing<sup>70</sup> is when the non-real, transformation of a thing, [in this case] the manifested world [consisting of] ignorance and the rest, reverts to the real itself, just as when a serpent, which is a transformation of a rope, becomes the rope itself. It is said:

Actually becoming different  
is an example of transmutation (*vikāra*);  
Apparently becoming different  
exemplifies transformation (*vivarta*).

तथाहि खलूच्यते यथैतद्भोगायतनचतुर्विधसकलस्थूलशरीरजातमेतद्भोग्यरूपान्नपानादिकमेतदाश्रयभूतभूरादिचतुर्दशभुवनान्येतदाश्रयभूतं ब्रह्माण्डं चैतदसर्वमेतेषां कारणरूपपञ्चीकृतभूतमात्रं भवति । एतानि शब्दादिविषयसहितानि पञ्चीकृतभूतजातानि सूक्ष्मशरीरजातं चैतत्सर्वमेतेषां कारणरूपमपञ्चीकृतभूतमात्रं भवति । एतानि सत्त्वादिगुणसहितान्यपञ्चीकृतपञ्चभूतान्युत्पत्तिव्युत्क्रमेणैतत्कारणभूताज्ञानोपहितचैतन्यमात्रं भवति । एतदज्ञानमज्ञानोपहितं चैतन्यं चे-  
श्वरादिकमेतदाधारभूतानुपहितचैतन्यरूपं तुरीयं ब्रह्ममात्रं भवति ॥ ११० ॥

110. For instance, it is described in such a way: the loci of enjoyment consisting of the four types of gross bodies, their objects of enjoyment such as food and drink, the fourteen worlds headed by Bhūs (Earth) which are the locations of those [the gross bodies and objects], and the universe which is the location of those [fourteen worlds], all become [resolved into] only their causes, the [five] combined elements. Those combined elements, along with their objects, sound, etc., and the subtle bodies, all become [resolved into] only their causes, the [five] uncombined elements. Those five uncombined elements along with the *guṇa*, *sattva* and so forth, in the reverse order of their appearance, become [resolved into] only their cause, consciousness characterized by ignorance. This ignorance and the consciousness characterized by it, the lord and so forth, become [resolved

<sup>70</sup>The word I am translating as disabusing is *apavāda* which means either censure or refutation. In a more literal sense it means speaking against. It is the process of freeing a person from the error or illusion of taking the world of appearance as real. More than the refutation of a philosophical position, it is a transformation in the way one sees, a deprogramming, that is only hinted at in the example of experiencing an illusory snake resolve into a real rope.

into] only their foundation, the 'Fourth,' Brahman, uncharacterized consciousness.

आभ्यामध्यारोपापवादाभ्यां तत्त्वम्पदार्थशोधनमपि सिद्धं भवति । त-  
थाह्यज्ञानादिसमष्टिरेतदुपहितं सर्वज्ञत्वादिविशिष्टं चैतन्यमेतदनुपहितं  
चैतन्यं चैतत्तयं तप्तायःपिण्डवदेकत्वेनावभासमानं तत्पदवाच्यार्थो भव-  
ति । एतदुपाध्युपहिताधारभूतमनुपहितं चैतन्यं तत्पदलक्ष्यार्थो भवति ॥  
१११ ॥

111. By this superimposition and disabusing the meanings of *tat* (that) and *tvam* (you) are also clarified.<sup>71</sup> For thus, these three, the collectivity of ignorance and so forth (1), consciousness characterized by that [collectivity] and qualified by omniscience and so forth (2), and consciousness uncharacterized by that [collectivity] (3), appearing as one, like a lump of heated iron [in which iron appears to be one with fire], are the direct meaning of the word *tat*. Uncharacterized consciousness, which is the support of that [consciousness] characterized by those qualifiers, is the indirect meaning of the word *tat*.

अज्ञानादिव्यष्टिरेतदुपहिताल्पज्ञत्वादिविशिष्टं चैतन्यमेतदनुपहितं चैत-  
न्यं चैतत्तयं तप्तायःपिण्डवदेकत्वेनावभासमानं त्वम्पदवाच्यार्थो भवति ।  
एतदुपाध्युपहिताधारभूतमनुपहितं प्रत्यगानन्दरूपं तुरीयं चैतन्यं त्व-  
म्पदलक्ष्यार्थो भवति ॥ ११२ ॥

112. Those three, distributive ignorance and the rest (1), consciousness characterized by that [distributive ignorance] and qualified by limited knowledge and so forth (2), and uncharacterized consciousness (3), appearing as one, like a lump of heated iron, are the direct meaning of the word *tvam*. The support of consciousness characterized by those qualifiers — uncharacterized consciousness — the 'Fourth' state in the form of inner joy, is the indirect meaning of the word *tvam*.

<sup>71</sup>These are the *tat* and *tvam* of the great pronouncement: *tat tvam asi* ("that you are" or, "you are that").

### 1.3.1 The Great Pronouncement

अथ महावाक्यार्थो वर्ण्यते । इदं तत्त्वमसि वाक्यं सम्बन्धत्रयेणाखण्डार्थ-  
बोधकं भवति । सम्बन्धत्रयं नाम पदयोः सामानाधिकरण्यं पदार्थयो-  
र्विशेषणविशेष्यभावः प्रत्यगात्मपदार्थयोर्लक्ष्यलक्षणभावश्चेति । तदुक्तम्

सामानाधिकरण्यं च विशेषणविशेष्यता ।  
लक्ष्यलक्षणसम्बन्धः पदार्थप्रत्यगात्मनाम् ॥ ११३ ॥

113. Now the great pronouncement is described. This statement: “that you are” [or, “you are that”], conveys unfragmented meaning by means of three relationships. Those three relationships are the sharing of location [i.e. co-reference] of the words (1), the relationship of qualification between the referents of the words (2), and the relationship of indirect signification of the referents of the words and the inner self (3). This is stated:

There are, between the words,  
their referents, and the inner self,  
relationships of shared location, of qualification,  
And of indirect signification. (*Naiṣkarmya-siddhi*, 3.3)

#### 1.3.1.1 Co-location (Co-reference)

सामानाधिकरण्यसम्बन्धस्तावद्यथा सोऽयं देवदत्त इति वा-  
क्ये तत्कालविशिष्टदेवदत्तवाचकसशब्दस्यैतत्कालविशिष्टदेवदत्तवाचका-  
यंशब्दस्य चैकस्मिन्देवदत्तपिण्डे तात्पर्यसम्बन्धः । तथा तत्र तत्त्वमसी-  
ति वाक्येऽपि परोक्षत्वादिविशिष्टचैतन्यवाचकतत्पदस्यापरोक्षत्वादिवि-  
शिष्टचैतन्यवाचकत्वम्पदस्य चैकस्मिंश्चैतन्ये तात्पर्यसम्बन्धः ॥ ११४ ॥

114. First, [comes] the relationship of shared location [or reference]. In the statement: “That one is this Devadatta,” the word “that,” which refers to Devadatta as qualified by that [past] time, and the word “this,” which refers to the Devadatta as qualified by this time, are connected by intended meaning to one Devadatta-substance. So too in the statement “That you

are," the word "that," which conveys consciousness qualified by being mediately known and so forth, and the word "you" which conveys consciousness qualified by being immediately known and so forth, are connected by intention to one consciousness.<sup>72</sup>

### 1.3.1.2 Qualification

विशेषणविशेष्यभावसम्बन्धस्तु यथा तत्रैव वाक्ये सशब्दार्थतत्कालविशिष्टदेवदत्तस्यायंशब्दार्थैतत्कालविशिष्टदेवदत्तस्य चान्योन्यभेदव्यावर्तकतया विशेषणविशेष्यभावः । तथात्रापि वाक्ये तत्पदार्थपरोक्षत्वादिविशिष्टचैतन्यस्य त्वम्पदार्थापरोक्षत्वादिविशिष्टचैतन्यस्य चान्योन्यभेदव्यावर्तकतया विशेषणविशेष्यभावः ॥ ११५ ॥

115. But the relationship of qualifier-qualified is this: in that same statement ["That one is this Devadatta"], Devadatta qualified by that time [the past], which is the meaning of the word "that" and Devadatta qualified by this time, which is the meaning of the word "this," have a relationship of qualifier-qualified that excludes the difference of one from the other. So too in this statement ["That you are"] consciousness qualified by being mediately known and so forth, which is the meaning of the word "that," and consciousness qualified by being immediately known and so forth, which is the meaning of the word "you," have a relationship of qualifier-qualified that excludes the difference of one from the other.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>72</sup>Commentator Nṛsiṃha Sarasvatī describes co-location or co-reference (*sāmānādhikarṇya*) as the use of words with different significations (*pravṛtti-nimitta*, lit. "reasons for use") for the same object. In this example the words with different significations are "that" and "this." "That" Devadatta, the Sanskrit equivalent of John Doe, means the Devadatta connected with some previous time and place. "This" Devadatta means the Devadatta connected with this place and time. Both "that" and "this" in this example refer to the same Devadatta, thus making this a case of co-reference.

<sup>73</sup>Nṛsiṃha Sarasvatī points out that the qualifier is the element in the relationship of qualification that distinguishes and the qualified is the one distinguished. For instance, with the addition of the qualifier "black" black horses are distinguished from white horses. In the statement "that one is this Devadatta," "that" can be regarded as the qualifier of "this" since it distinguishes this Devadatta who is the same as the Devadatta of the past from those that are not the same. The case is the same if the positions are reversed: "this one is that Devadatta." Thus they are capable of mutual qualification. In such cases, all difference between the two referents is excluded, making them the same.

## 1.3.1.3 Indirect Signification

लक्ष्यलक्षणभावसम्बन्धस्तु यथा तत्रैव सशब्दायंशब्दयोस्तदर्थयोर्वा वि-  
रुद्धतत्कालैतत्कालविशिष्टत्वपरित्यागेनाविद्धदेवदत्तेन सह लक्ष्यलक्ष-  
णभावः। तथात्रापि वाक्ये तत्त्वम्पदयोस्तदर्थयोर्वा विरुद्धपरोक्षत्वाप-  
रोक्षत्वादिविशिष्टत्वपरित्यागेनाविरुद्धचैतन्येन सह लक्ष्यलक्षणभावः।  
इयमेव भागलक्षणेत्युच्यते ॥ ११६ ॥

116. But the relationship of indirect signification is: in that statement [“that is this Devadatta”] the words “that” and “this” or their meanings, by giving up being qualified by the contradictory traits “that time” and “this time,” have a relationship of indirect signification with the uncontradicted Devadatta. So in this statement [“that you are”] the words “that” and “you” or their meanings, through giving up being qualified by contradictory traits like being mediately known and being immediately known, have a relationship of indirect signification with uncontradicted consciousness.<sup>74</sup> This is partial indirect signification (*bhāga-lakṣaṇā*).

## 1.3.1.4 Failure of Direct Signification

अस्मिन्वाक्ये नीलमुत्पलमिति वाक्यवद्वाक्यार्थो न सङ्गच्छते। तत्र तु  
नीलपदार्थनीलगुणस्योत्प-  
लपदार्थोत्पलद्रव्यस्य च शौक्ल्यपटादिभेदव्यावर्तकतयान्योन्यविशेष-  
णविशेष्यरूपसंसर्गस्यान्यतरविशिष्टस्यान्यतरस्य तदैक्यस्य वा वाक्या-  
र्थत्वाङ्गीकरणे प्रमाणान्तरविरोधाभावात्तद्वाक्यार्थः सङ्गच्छते। अत्र तु  
तत्पदार्थपरोक्षत्वादिविशिष्टचैतन्यस्य त्वम्पदार्थापरोक्षत्वादिविशिष्टचै-  
तन्यस्य चान्योन्यभेदव्यावर्तकतया विशेषणविशेष्यभावसंसर्गस्यान्यत-

This does not work in the case of “black” and “horse.”

<sup>74</sup>The words “that” and “this” directly signify Devadatta as qualified by that time and that place and Devadatta as qualified by this time and this place. Indirectly they signify Devadatta as unqualified by either time or place, but in order for that to happen the contradictory parts of their meanings ( “that time and place” and “this time and place”) must be rejected. This sort of signification is called indirect signification. The same is true of the “that” and the “you” in “that you are.” They indirectly signify unqualified consciousness and thus show the relationship of indirect signification.

रविशिष्टस्यान्यतरस्य तदैक्यस्य वा वाक्यार्थाङ्गीकारे प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाण-  
विरोधाद्वाक्यार्थो न सङ्गच्छते ॥ ११७ ॥ (तदुक्तम्

संसर्गो वा विशिष्टो वा वाक्यार्थो नात्र सम्मतः ।  
अखण्डैकरसत्त्वेन वाक्यार्थो विदुषां मतः ॥ इति<sup>75</sup>

117. In this statement [“that you are”] the meaning is not coherent like in the statement “the lily is blue.” When the [latter] statement’s meaning is accepted either as the union with one another of the qualifier-qualified, in which the quality blue, which is the meaning of the word “blue,” and the substance lily, which is the meaning of the word “lily,” act as excluders of differences like whiteness and cloth, or as the oneness with the other of one of them qualified by that other, the meaning of the sentence is coherent because there is no contradiction through some other means of knowledge. But here [in this case], when one takes the meaning of the sentence to be the union of the qualifier, [i.e.] consciousness qualified by being mediately known and so forth, which is the meaning of the word “that,” with the qualified, [i.e.] consciousness qualified by being immediately known and so forth, which is the meaning of the word “you,” through the exclusion of their mutual differences, or [when one takes the meaning of the sentence to be] the oneness with the other of one of them qualified by that other, the meaning of the sentence is not coherent because of its contradiction by other means of knowledge [such as perception, and so forth]. (It is said:

Connection or qualification  
Is not the meaning preferred here.  
The statement’s meaning the wise consider  
To be unbroken unity. (*Pañcadaśī*, 7.75)<sup>76</sup>

<sup>75</sup>This verse is not found in Medhācāitanyā’s edition, but is in the other editions.

<sup>76</sup>The author begins to explain why, in the Advaita interpretation, the great pronouncement “that you are” is an example of partial indirect signification. Indirect signification is appealed to when direct signification fails for some reason. That will be demonstrated in the next section along with two types of indirect signification: that involving rejection and that not involving rejection of the direct sense. The great pronouncement “That you are,” as we shall see, requires partial rejection and partial non-rejection of the direct meaning. It is, therefore, partial indirect signification.



## 1.3.1.5 Indirect Signification Involving Rejection

अत्र तु गङ्गायां घोषः प्रतिवसतीति वाक्यवज्जहल्लक्षणापि न सङ्गच्छते । तत्र तु गङ्गाघोषयोराधाराधेयभावलक्षणस्य वाक्यार्थस्याशेषतो विरुद्धत्वाद्वाक्यार्थमशेषतः परित्यज्य तत्सम्बन्धितीरलक्षणाया युक्तत्वाज्जहल्लक्षणा सङ्गच्छते । अत्र तु परोक्षत्वापरोक्षत्वादिविशिष्टचैतन्यैकत्वरूपस्य वाक्यार्थस्य भागमात्रे विरोधाद्वागान्तरमपि परित्यज्यान्यलक्षणाया अयुक्तत्वाज्जहल्लक्षणा न सङ्गच्छते ॥ ११८ ॥

118. Here [in the case of “that you are”], however, the indirect signification that involves rejection is not appropriate as it is in the sentence “the village resides on the Ganges.” There [in the village statement], since the meaning of the statement — which posits an [impossible] supporting and supported relationship between the Ganges and the village — is entirely contradicted, and since only after completely rejecting that meaning does the indirect signification of [the village’s being on] the bank connected with [the Ganges] become applicable, indirect signification involving rejection is appropriate. Here, however, [in the statement “that you are”], since the meaning of the statement, which posits the oneness of consciousness characterized by both mediacy and immediacy, is only partially contradictory and since rejecting the other [non-contradictory] part as well [as the contradictory part] and indirectly signifying something else is unjustified, indirect signification involving rejection is not applicable here.

न च गङ्गापदं स्वार्थपरित्यागेन तीरपदार्थं यथा लक्षयति तथा तत्पदं त्वम्पदं वा स्वार्थपरित्यागेन त्वम्पदार्थं तत्पदार्थं वा लक्षयत्वतः कुतो जहल्लक्षणा न सङ्गच्छत इति वाच्यम् । तत्र तीरपदाश्रवणेन तदर्थप्रतीतौ लक्षणया तत्प्रतीत्यपेक्षायामपि तत्त्वम्पदयोः श्रूयमाणत्वेन तदर्थप्रतीतौ लक्षणया पुनरन्यतरपदेनान्यतरपदार्थप्रतीत्यपेक्षाभावात् ॥ ११९ ॥

119. Nor can it be objected: “just as the word ‘Ganges’ indirectly signifies the meaning ‘bank’ by giving up its own meaning, so too let the word ‘that’ or the word ‘you’ signify, after giving up their own meanings, the meaning ‘you’ [in the case of that] or the meaning ‘that’ [in the case of you] and, thus, why is indirect signification involving rejection not appropriate?” [To

this objection the reply is] though there [in the Ganges statement] there is a dependence on indirect signification when the meaning “bank” is not perceived because the word “bank” is not heard, here, because the words “that” and “you” are heard [in the statement], there is no further dependence for the apprehension of their meanings on the apprehension of the meaning of one of them by means of the other of them through indirect signification.

### 1.3.1.6 Indirect Signification Involving Non-rejection

अत्र शोणो धावतीतिवाक्यवदजहल्लक्षणापि न सङ्गच्छते । तत्र शोण-  
गुणगमनलक्षणस्य वाक्यार्थस्य विरुद्धत्वात्तदपरित्यागेन तदाश्रयाश्चा-  
दिलक्षणया तद्विरोधपरिहारसम्भवादजहल्लक्षणा सम्भवति । अत्र तु  
परोक्षत्वापरोक्षत्वादिविशिष्टचैतन्यैकत्वस्य वाक्यार्थस्य विरुद्धत्वात्तद-  
परित्यागेन तत्सम्बन्धिनो यस्य कस्यचिदर्थस्य लक्षितत्वेऽपि तद्विरो-  
धपरिहारासम्भवादजहल्लक्षणापि न सम्भवत्येव ॥ १२० ॥

120. Here indirect signification involving non-rejection [of the primary meaning] does not fit like [it does] in the statement “The bay runs.” There, because the statement’s meaning, which is that the color “bay,” a quality, is moving, is contradictory,<sup>77</sup> and because it is possible to remove that contradiction by indirectly signifying the horse that is the substratum of that quality without rejecting the meaning [of bay], indirect signification involving non-rejection is possible. Here [in the statement “that you are”], however, the meaning of the statement, which is that consciousness characterized by both mediacy and immediacy is one, is contradictory, and it is not possible to remove that contradiction, even when something related to the direct meaning is indirectly signified, without giving up the direct meaning. For these reasons, indirect signification involving non-rejection is not possible.

न च तत्पदं त्वम्पदं वा स्वार्थविरुद्धांशपरित्यागेनांशान्तरसहितं त्व-  
म्पदार्थं तत्पदार्थं वा लक्षयत्वतः कथं प्रकारान्तरेण भागलक्षणाङ्गी-  
करणमिति वाच्यम् । एकेन पदेन स्वार्थांशपदार्थान्तरोभयलक्षणाया

<sup>77</sup>It is deemed impossible for qualities to move by themselves.

असम्भवात्पदान्तरेण तदर्थप्रतीतौ लक्षणया पुनस्तत्प्रतीत्यपेक्षाभावा-  
च्च ॥ १२१ ॥

121. Nor can it be objected: “let either the word ‘that’ or the word ‘you’ give up the contradictory part of its meaning and indirectly signify either the ‘you’ meaning or the ‘that’ meaning [respectively] and thus why accept partial indirect signification in some other manner?” [That cannot be] because it is impossible to signify indirectly both a word’s own meaning and the meaning of another word by means of only one word and because when the meaning of a word is conveyed by that word there is no necessity of conveying that meaning again by means of indirect signification.

तस्माद्यथा सोऽयं देवदत्त इति वाक्यं तदर्थो वा तत्कालैतत्कालविशिष्टदेवदत्तलक्षणस्य वाक्यार्थस्यांशे विरोधाद्विरुद्धतत्कालैतत्कालविशिष्टत्वांशं परित्यज्याविरुद्धदेवदत्तांशमात्रं लक्षयति तथा तत्त्वमसीति वाक्यं तदर्थो वा परोक्षत्वापरोक्षत्वादिविशिष्टचैतन्यैकत्वलक्षणस्य वाक्यार्थस्यांशे विरोधाद्विरुद्धपरोक्षत्वापरोक्षत्वादिविशिष्टत्वांशं परित्यज्याविरुद्धमखण्डचैतन्यमात्रं लक्षयति ॥ १२२ ॥

122. Therefore, the statement “that one is this Devadatta” or its meaning, because its meaning (which posits a Devadatta qualified by both that time and this time) is contradictory in part, indirectly signifies Devadatta himself who is the uncontradicted [portion of the meaning] after giving up the contradictory portions — his being qualified by both that time and this time. In a similar way, the statement “that you are” or its meaning (which is partially contradictory because of positing a sameness of consciousness that is characterized by both mediacy and immediacy) indirectly signifies unfragmented consciousness, the uncontradicted [portion of the meaning], after giving up the contradictory portions — its being qualified by both mediacy and immediacy.

### 1.3.1.7 “I am Brahman”

अथाधुनाहं ब्रह्मास्मीत्यनुभववाक्यार्थो वर्ण्यते । एवमाचार्येणाध्यारोपापवादपुरःसरं तत्त्वम्पदार्थो शोधयित्वा वाक्येनाखण्डार्थेऽवबोधि-

तेऽधिकारिणोऽहं नित्यशुद्धबुद्धमुक्तसत्यस्वभावपरमानन्दानन्ताद्वयं ब्रह्मास्मीत्यखण्डाकाराकारिता चित्तवृत्तिरुदेति ॥ १२३ ॥

123. Now then the meaning of the statement of realization “I am Brahman” is described. Thus, having clarified the meanings of “that” and “you” following the [teaching of] superimposition and disabusal, when the unfragmented meaning is made known by the teacher through the statement [“that you are”], a mental operation arises for the qualified student that is shaped by unfragmented form [Brahman]: “I am the eternal, pure, liberated, true-natured, most joyful, unlimited, unparalleled Brahman.”

### 1.3.1.8 The Mental Event Shaped by Unfragmented Form

सा तु चित्रप्रतिबिम्बसहिता सती प्रत्यगभिन्नमज्ञातं परं ब्रह्म विषयीकृत्य तद्गताज्ञानमेव बाधते । तदा पटकारणतन्तुदाहे पटदाहवदखिलकार्यकारणेऽज्ञाने बाधिते सति तत्कार्यस्याखिलस्य बाधितत्वात्तदन्तर्भूताखण्डाकाराकारिता चित्तवृत्तिरपि बाधिता भवति ॥ १२४ ॥

124. But that mental operation being combined with the reflection of consciousness takes as its object the unknown, highest Brahman, non-different from the inner Self, and impedes the ignorance covering it. Then, like the burning of a cloth when its cause, the thread, burns, when ignorance, the cause of all effects, is impeded, all of its effects also are impeded and because of that the mental operation shaped by unfragmented form, which is among those effects, is impeded, too.

### 1.3.1.9 Reflected Consciousness Overpowered

तत्र वृत्तौ प्रतिबिम्बितं चैतन्यमपि यथा दीपप्रभादित्यप्रभावभासनासमर्था सती तयाभिभूता भवति तथा स्वयम्प्रकाशमानप्रत्यगभिन्नपरब्रह्मावभासनानर्हतया तेनाभिभूतं सत्स्वोपाधिभूताखण्डवृत्तेर्बाधितत्वादर्पणाभावे मुखप्रतिबिम्बस्य मुखमात्रत्ववत्प्रत्यगभिन्नपरब्रह्ममात्रं भवति ॥ १२५ ॥

125. Just as the light of a lamp, being unable to illumine the light of the sun, is [instead] overwhelmed by it, so the reflected consciousness

in that [mental operation], being unable to illumine that self-illuminous supreme Brahman, which is non-different from the internal Self, is overpowered by it. And because that unfragmented mental operation, which is its [reflected consciousness'] delimiter, is impeded, only supreme Brahman, non-different from the internal Self remains, just as the reflection of a face becomes the face itself when the mirror is removed.

एवं च सति मनसैवानुद्रष्टव्यं यन्मनसा न मनुत इत्यनयोः श्रुत्योरवि-  
रोधो वृत्तिव्याप्यत्वाङ्गीकारेण फलव्याप्यत्वप्रतिषेधप्रतिपादनात् । तदु-  
क्तम्

फलव्याप्यत्वमेवास्य शास्त्रकृद्भिर्निवारितम् ।  
ब्रह्मण्यज्ञाननाशाय वृत्तिव्याप्तिरपेक्षिता ॥ इति  
स्वयम्प्रकाशमानत्वान्नाभास उपयुज्यते च ॥ इति च ॥ १२६ ॥

126. And when such is the case, the two revealed texts “it is to be seen by the mind” (*Bṛhad. U.*, 4.4.19) and “that which one does not know by the mind” (*Kena U.*, 1.5) do not contradict one another, because [in this unique case] while pervasion of the operation is accepted, pervasion of result is denied.<sup>78</sup> That is said:

Its pervasion of the result, indeed,  
is forbidden by writers of scripture.  
For the destruction of ignorance in Brahman,  
pervasion of operation is accepted. (*Pañcadaśī*, 6.90)

<sup>78</sup>This is a somewhat difficult point to understand. It depends on knowing how the Vedāntin understands the way cognition takes place. Ordinarily, there are two aspects of cognition: the operation (*vṛtti*) of the mind which destroys the ignorance covering an object and then the revelation of that object itself by the reflected consciousness of the mind, which revelation is thought of as the result (*phala*). This holds true for all cognitions except when the object is Brahman. When Brahman is the object of the cognition, the first aspect (*vṛtti*) still operates in destroying ignorance, but the second aspect (*phala*) which illumines the object with reflected consciousness cannot function because the “object” (Brahman) is itself the self-luminous source of all illumination. It would be like holding up a candle to try to illumine the sun. This in the view of the Vedāntin resolves a contradiction found in the Upaniṣads which seem to say both that the mind can and cannot know Brahman. As operation it can and as result it cannot. This is explained in more detail in the next section.

and,

Because of being self-illuminating,  
reflection [by another] is improper. (*Pañcadaśī*, 6.92)

जडपदार्थाकाराकारितचित्तवृत्तेर्विशेषोऽस्ति । तथाहि अयं घट इति  
घटाकाराकारितचित्तवृत्तिरज्ञातं घटं विषयीकृत्य तद्गताज्ञाननिरसन-  
पुरःसरं स्वगतचिदाभासेन जडं घटमपि भासयति । तदुक्तम्

बुद्धितत्स्थचिदाभासौ द्वावपि व्याप्नुतो घटम् ।  
तत्राज्ञानं धिया नश्येदाभासेन घटः स्फुरेत् ॥ इति ॥

यथा प्रदीपप्रभामण्डलमन्धकारगतं घटपटादिकं विषयीकृत्य तद्गता-  
न्धकारनिरसनपुरःसरं स्वप्रभया तदपि भासयतीति ॥ १२७ ॥

127. The mental operation that assumes the form of a material object is different. For example, the mental event that assumes the form of a pot [in the cognition] “this is a pot” making an unknown pot its object, after removing the ignorance in it, illumines the unconscious pot with the reflection of consciousness in itself [i.e. in the mental operation]. That is stated:

Intellect and the reflected consciousness in it,  
both of them pervade the pot.  
The ignorance in it [the pot] is destroyed by intellect,  
the pot is revealed by the reflection [of consciousness]. (*Pañcadaśī*,  
7.91)

[It is] just as the circle of light of a lamp, falling on a pot or cloth in darkness, illuminates them with its own light after destroying the darkness there.

## 1.4 The Means to Enlightenment

एवभूतस्वस्वरूपचैतन्यसाक्षात्कारपर्यन्तं श्रवणमनननिदिध्यासनसमा-  
ध्यनुष्ठानस्यापेक्षितत्वात्तेऽपि प्रदर्श्यन्ते ॥ १२८ ॥

128. Because one is dependent upon the performance of listening, thinking, contemplating, and concentration until one has such a direct experience of consciousness as one's own true nature, they, too, will be demonstrated.

### 1.4.1 Listening

श्रवणं नाम षड्विधलिङ्गैरशेषवेदान्तानामद्वितीयवस्तुनि तात्पर्यावधारणम् । लिङ्गानि तूपक्रमोपसंहाराभ्यासापूर्वताफलार्थवादोपपत्त्याख्या-  
नि । तदुक्तम्<sup>79</sup>

उपक्रमोपसंहाराभ्यासोऽपूर्वता फलम् ।  
अर्थवादोपपत्ती च लिङ्गं तात्पर्यनिर्णये ॥ १२९ ॥

129. Listening is determining the meaning of limitless Vedānta texts to be the non-dual substance by means of the six indicators. The indicators are the opening statement, the closing statement, repetition, novelty, result, glorification, and justification. That is stated:

Opening and closing statements,  
repetition, novelty, and result,  
glorification as well as justification;  
these are the signs in ascertaining the meaning. (*Bṛhatsaṃhitā*)

<sup>79</sup>The following quote is not found in the edition of the text by Hiriyanna. Its inclusion in the commentary of Nṛsiṃha Sarasvatī suggests that it was not originally a part of the text.

## 1.4.1.1 The Indicators

तत्र प्रकरणप्रतिपाद्यस्यार्थस्य तदाद्यन्तयोरुपपादनमुपक्रमोपसंहारौ । यथा छान्दोग्ये षष्ठे प्रपाठके प्रकरणप्रतिपाद्यस्याद्वितीयवस्तुन एकमेवाद्वितीयमित्यादावेतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वमित्यन्ते च प्रतिपादनम् । प्रकरणप्रतिपाद्यस्य वस्तुनस्तन्मध्ये पौनःपुन्येन प्रतिपादनमभ्यासः । यथा तत्रैवाद्वितीयवस्तुनो मध्ये तत्त्वमसीति नवकृत्वः प्रतिपादनम् । प्रकरणप्रतिपाद्यस्याद्वितीयवस्तुनः प्रमानान्तराविषयीकरणमपूर्वता । यथा तत्रैवाद्वितीयवस्तुनो मानान्तराविषयीकरणम् । फलं तु प्रकरणप्रतिपाद्यस्यात्मज्ञानस्य तदनुष्ठानस्य वा तत्र तत्र श्रूयमाणं प्रयोजनम् । यथा तत्राचार्यवान् पुरुषो वेद तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ सम्पत्स्य इत्यद्वितीयवस्तुज्ञानस्य तत्प्राप्तिः प्रयोजनं श्रूयते । प्रकरणप्रतिपाद्यस्य तत्र तत्र प्रशंसनमर्थवादः । यथा तत्रैव उत तमादेशमप्राक्षो येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवत्यमतं मतमविज्ञातं विज्ञातमित्यद्वितीयवस्तुप्रशंसनम् । प्रकरणप्रतिपाद्यार्थसाधने तत्र तत्र श्रूयमाणा युक्तिरुपपत्तिः । यथा तत्र यथा सौम्यैकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृन्मयं विज्ञातं स्याद्वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यमित्यादावद्वितीयवस्तुसाधने विकारस्य वाचारम्भणमात्रत्वे युक्तिः श्रूयते ॥ १३० ॥

130. The opening and closing is the presentation of the meaning that is to be established by a treatise at its beginning and its end, as, for instance, in the sixth section of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, the non-dual substance, which is the meaning to be established in the text, is promoted in the beginning with “one only without a second” (*Chānd. U.*, 6.2.1) and at the end with “all of this is one with that” (*Chānd. U.*, 6.8.7). Repetition is the repeated statement of the matter to be established by a treatise in its middle, as, for instance, in that same text, the presentation of the non-dual substance nine times in its middle with “that you are.” Novelty is making the matter to be established in a treatise beyond the scope of any other means of knowledge, as, for instance, in that same text the non-dual substance is presented as beyond the scope of any other means of correct knowledge. Result, however, is the reason referred to here and there for knowledge of the Self, or for its cultivation, which is the subject-matter of a treatise. For instance, in the same text the reason for knowledge of non-dual sub-



stance is the attainment of that (non- dual substance). [Result] is found in: “A person who has a teacher knows (Brahman). His delay is as long as he is not freed (from the body). Then he will attain (Brahman)” (*Chānd. U.*, 6.14.2). Glorification is the praise here and there of the subject matter of a treatise, as, for instance, the praise in the same text of the non-dual substance with: “Did you inquire about that teaching by which the unheard becomes heard, the unthought thought, and the unknown known?” (*Chānd. U.*, 6.1.2-3). Justification is the argument that is heard here and there in support of the meaning to be established in a treatise, as, for instance, in the same text, in order to establish non-dual substance, an argument is heard in favor of the mere verbal difference of transformations with texts like “O dear one, by one lump of clay all clay things are known. A transformation is only a name originating in speech. ‘Clay,’ indeed is the truth,” (*Chānd. U.*, 6.1.4).

### 1.4.2 Thinking

मननं तु श्रुतस्याद्वितीयवस्तुनो वेदान्तार्थानुगुणयुक्तिभिरनवरतमनुचि-  
न्तनम् ॥ १३१ ॥

131. Thinking is uninterrupted reflection on the non-dual substance that one has heard about through arguments favorable to the meaning of the Vedānta.

### 1.4.3 Contemplation

विजातीयदेहादिप्रत्ययरहिताद्वितीयवस्तुसजातीयप्रत्ययप्रवाहो निदि-  
ध्यासनम् ॥ १३२ ॥

132. Contemplation is a flow of cognitions homogenous with non-dual substance that is free of cognitions of body and so forth that are heterogeneous [with non-dual substance].

### 1.4.4 Concentration

समाधिर्द्विविधः सविकल्पको निर्विकल्पकश्चेति ॥ १३३ ॥

133. Concentration is of two kinds: discriminate and non-discriminate.

#### 1.4.4.1 Discriminate Concentration

तत्र सविकल्पो नाम ज्ञातृज्ञानादिविकल्पलयानपेक्षयाद्वितीयवस्तुनि त-  
दाकाराकारितायाश्चित्तवृत्तेरवस्थानम् । तदा मृन्मयगजादिभानेऽपि मृ-  
ज्ञानवद्वैतभानेऽप्यद्वैतं वस्तु भासते । तदुक्तमभियुक्तैः

दृशिस्वरूपं गगनोपमं परम्  
सकृद्विभातं त्वजमेकमक्षरम् ।  
अलेपकं सर्वगतं यदद्वयम्  
तदेव चाहं सततं विमुक्तमोम् ॥ इति ॥ १३४ ॥<sup>80</sup>

134. Among them, discriminate concentration is the presence of a men-  
tal operation that has taken the form of the non-dual substance in the  
non-dual substance [but] without dependence on the dissolution of dis-  
tinctions such as knower, knowledge, and so forth. Like the perception of  
clay even in the perception of clay elephants and so forth, the non-dual  
substance appears even in the perception of duality. That is said by the  
well-versed:

Of the nature of vision, like the sky, supreme,

<sup>80</sup> Another verse of unknown origin is found in Medhācāitanyā's edition:

दृशिस्तु शुद्धोऽहमविक्रियात्मको ।  
न मेऽस्ति बन्धो न च मे विमोक्षः ॥

Pure vision [consciousness] am I,  
unchanging in essence.  
Neither am I bound nor am I liberated.

Once manifested, unborn, one, undiminishing,  
 Unblemished, all-pervasive, is that non-dual,  
 And that indeed am I, eternally liberated, - "Om"!  
 (*Upadeśa-sāhasrī*, 73 or 10.1)

#### 1.4.4.2 Non-discriminate Concentration

निर्विकल्पकस्तु ज्ञातृज्ञानादिविकल्पलयापेक्षयाद्वितीयवस्तुनि तदाका-  
 राकारितायाश्चित्तवृत्तेरतितरामेकीभावेनावस्थानम् ॥ १३५ ॥

135. Non-discriminate concentration is the highly unified abidance in the non-dual substance of a mental operation that has taken its form and that depends on the dissolution of distinctions such as knower, knowledge, and so forth.

तदा तु जलाकाराकारितलवणानवभासेन जलमात्रावभासवदद्विती-  
 यवस्त्वाकाराकारितचित्तवृत्त्यनवभासेनाद्वितीयवस्तुमात्रमेवावभासते ।  
 ततश्चास्य सुषुप्तेश्चाभेदशङ्का न भवति । उभयत्र वृत्त्यभाने समानेऽपि  
 तत्सद्भावासद्भावमात्रेणानयोर्भेदोपपत्तेः ॥ १३६ ॥

136. Then, however, like the appearance of only water through the non-appearance of salt that has assumed the form of water,<sup>81</sup> through the non-appearance of the mental operation that has assumed the form of non-dual substance, only non-dual substance appears. And then there is no confusion concerning a lack of distinction between it [non-discriminate concentration] and deep sleep, because, although they are the same with respect to the non-cognition of the mental operation in both, their difference is justified on the basis of its [the mental operation's] persistence [in non-discriminate concentration] and its absence [in deep sleep].

<sup>81</sup>This is a reference to a story told in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (6.13) about the teacher Uddālaka Āruṇi who asked his son Śvetaketu to place a lump of salt in a container of water and leave it overnight. The next day the sage asks his son to retrieve the salt. Naturally, the salt is gone having dissolved into the water. Śvetaketu, however, was able to taste the salt in the water, but not see it. There, the salt stood for the all-pervading nature of the Self or Brahman. Here, it represents the highest state of concentration, non-discriminate concentration in which the mind is still present, but cannot be distinguished from the non-dual substance. The example is also used in the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (2.4.12).

### 1.4.4.3 The Eight Parts of Concentration

अस्याङ्गानि यमनियमासनप्राणायामप्रत्याहारधारणाध्यानसमाधयः ॥  
१३७ ॥

137. The subsidiary parts of that (non-discriminate concentration) are restraint, observance, posture, breath control, withdrawal, fixation, meditation, and concentration.<sup>82</sup>

तत्राहिंसासत्यास्तेयब्रह्मचर्यापरिग्रहा यमाः ॥ १३८ ॥

138. Therein, the restraints are non-violence, [speaking] the truth, not stealing, celibacy, and lack of possessiveness.

शौचसन्तोषतपःस्वाध्यायेश्वरप्रणिधानानि नियमाः ॥ १३९ ॥

139. The observances are cleanliness, satisfaction, austerity, study, and worship of the lord.

करचरणादिसंस्थानविशेषलक्षणानि पद्मस्वस्तिकादीन्यासनानि ॥ १४० ॥

140. The postures are particular arrangements of the hands, feet, and so forth such as the lotus posture, the *svastika* posture and the rest.

रेचकपूरककुम्भकलक्षणाः प्राणनिग्रहोपायाः प्राणायामाः ॥ १४१ ॥

141. Ways of restraining the breath characterized by exhaling, inhaling, and retaining are breath control.

इन्द्रियाणां स्वस्वविषयेभ्यः प्रत्याहारणं प्रत्याहारः ॥ १४२ ॥

142. Withdrawal is drawing the senses away from their respective objects.

अद्वितीयवस्तुन्यन्तरिन्द्रियधारणं धारणा ॥ १४३ ॥

143. Holding the inner sense [the mind] on the non-dual substance is fixation.

तत्राद्वितीयवस्तुनि विच्छिद्य विच्छिद्यान्तरिन्द्रियवृत्तिप्रवाहो ध्यानम् ॥  
१४४ ॥

<sup>82</sup>Here the system of classical yoga consisting of eight steps or parts is adapted to the practice of Advaita Vedānta.

144. Meditation is the occasionally interrupted flow of mental operations toward the non-dual substance.

समाधिस्तूतः सविकल्पक एव ॥ १४५ ॥

145. Concentration, however, is the discriminate concentration described before.

#### 1.4.4.4 Obstacles to Concentration

एवमस्याङ्गिनो निर्विकल्पकस्य लयविक्षेपकषायरसास्वादलक्षणाश्चत्वारो विघ्नाः सम्भवन्ति ॥ १४६ ॥

146. So, too, are possible four impediments to this primary, non-discriminate concentration: dissolution, distraction, being tainted, and indulgence in joy.

लयस्तावदखण्डवस्त्वनवलम्बनेन चित्तवृत्तेर्निद्रा ॥ १४७ ॥

147. First of all, dissolution is the sleep of the mental operation through not resorting to unbroken substance.

अखण्डवस्त्वनवलम्बनेन चित्तवृत्तेरन्यावलम्बनं विक्षेपः ॥ १४८ ॥

148. Distraction is a mental operation's resorting to other things through not resting in unbroken substance.

लयविक्षेपाभावेऽपि चित्तवृत्ते रागादिवासनया स्तब्धीभावादखण्डवस्त्वनवलम्बनं कषायः ॥ १४९ ॥

149. Even when there is no dissolution or distraction, there is tainting which is not resorting to unbroken substance because of being blocked by the latent impressions of passion and so forth.

अखण्डवस्त्वनवलम्बनेऽपि चित्तवृत्तेः सविकल्पकानन्दास्वादनं रसास्वादः । समाध्यारम्भसमये सविकल्पकानन्दास्वादनं वा ॥ १५० ॥

150. Indulgence in joy is the mental operation's relishing of the joy of discriminate concentration even without resorting to unbroken substance,

or, the mental operation's relishing of the joy of discriminate concentration at the time of the beginning of concentration.

अनेन विघ्नचतुष्टयेन विरहितं चित्तं निर्वातदीपवदचलं सदखण्डचैत-  
न्यमात्रमवतिष्ठते यदा तदा निर्विकल्पकः समाधिरित्युच्यते ॥ १५१ ॥

151. Therefore, when the mind, free of the four types of impediments, being motionless like a lamp flame in a windless place, is situated in unbroken consciousness alone, that is called non-discriminate concentration.

तदुक्तम्

लये सम्बोधयेच्चित्तं विक्षिप्तं शमयेत्पुनः ।  
सकषायं विजानीयाच्छ्रमप्राप्तं न चालयेत् ॥  
नास्वसादयेद्रसं तत्र निःसङ्गः प्रज्ञया भवेद् ॥ इति ॥

यथा दीपो निवातस्थो नेङ्गते सोपमा स्मृतेति च ॥ १५२ ॥

152. That is said:

In dissolution should one awaken,  
The mind distracted one must control,  
The tainted mind one should know well,  
Do not force a mind possessed of control,  
One should not enjoy sentimental rapture,  
One becomes free of attachment to that by wisdom. (*Gauḍapāda-  
kārikā*, 3.44-45)

As a lamp in a windless place moves not,  
That is the analogy [to be] remembered. (*Bhagavad-gītā*, 6.19)

## 1.5 The Living Liberated

अथ जीवन्मुक्तलक्षणमुच्यते । जीवन्मुक्तो नाम स्वस्वरूपाखण्डशुद्धब्रह्म-  
ज्ञानेन तदज्ञानबाधनद्वारा स्वस्वरूपाखण्डे ब्रह्मणि साक्षात्कृते सत्यज्ञा-  
नतत्कार्यसञ्चितकर्मसंशयविपर्ययादीनामपि बाधितत्वादखिलबन्धरहि-  
तो ब्रह्मनिष्ठः ।

भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिश्छिद्यन्ते सर्वसंशयाः ।  
 क्षीयन्ते चास्य कर्माणि तस्मिन्दृष्टे परावर इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥  
 १५३ ॥

153. Now the characteristics of one liberated while yet alive are described. A person liberated while still living is established in Brahman and free of all bindings because when he witnesses his own true essence, unbroken Brahman, by means of the eradication of ignorance about it by knowledge of his own true nature as pure Brahman, ignorance and its effects, accumulated results of past action, doubt and error are eradicated. [This is known] from the revealed text:

The knot in the heart is broken,  
 All doubts are cut asunder,  
 And his actions are destroyed  
 When the highest is seen. (*Mu.U.*, 2.28)

अयं तु व्युत्थानसमये मांसशोणितमुत्रपुरीषादिभाजनेन शरीरेणान्ध्य-  
 मान्द्यापटुत्वादिभाजनेनेन्द्रियग्रामेणाशनायापिपासाशोक-  
 मोहादिभाजनेन अन्तःकरणेन च तत्तत्पूर्वपूर्ववासनया क्रियमाणानि  
 कर्माणि भुज्यमानानि ज्ञानाविरुद्धारद्धफलानि च पश्यन्नपि बाधित-  
 त्वात्परमार्थतो न पश्यति । यथेदमिन्द्रजालमितिज्ञानवांस्तदिन्द्रजालं  
 पश्यन्नपि परमार्थमिदमिति न पश्यति । शचक्षुरचक्षुरिव सकर्णोऽकर्ण  
 इव समनाअमना इव सप्राणोऽप्राण इवेत्यादिश्रुतेः । उक्तं च

सुषुप्तवज्जाग्रति यो न पश्यति  
 द्वयं च पश्यन्नपि चाद्वयत्वतः ।  
 तथा च कुर्वन्नपि निष्क्रियश्च यः  
 सात्मविन्नान्य इतीह निश्चयः ॥ इति ॥ १५४ ॥

154. That person, when not situated [in concentration], sees the actions being performed through various previously planted, latent impressions and the already fructifying results he is enjoying that are not inconsistent

with knowledge through his body which is a repository of flesh, blood, urine and stool, through his senses which are the loci of blindness, slowness, and clumsiness, and through his internal organ which is the bearer of hunger, thirst, sadness, delusion, and so forth; but because they are refuted he does not see them as truly real. [It is] just like someone who knows “this is a magic trick;” even though he sees the magic he does not think “this is really happening.” [This is known] from the revealed text:

Though possessing eyes, he is as if without eyes;  
 though having ears, he is as if without ears;  
 though having a mind, he is as if without a mind;  
 and though having life, he is as if without life.<sup>83</sup>

It is also said:

One who in waking is like one in dreamless sleep,  
 And, though seeing duality, sees it not  
 Because of being non-dual,  
 And who is actionless, though acting,  
 He is a knower of Self, no one other.  
 This is certain. (*Upadeśa-sāhasrī*, 84)

अस्य ज्ञानात्पूर्वं विद्यमानानामेवाहारविहारादीनामनुवृत्तिवच्छुभवास-  
 नानामेवानुवृत्तिर्भवति शुभाशुभयोरौदासीन्यं वा । तदुक्तम्

बुद्धाद्वैतसतत्त्वस्य यथेष्टाचरणं यदि ।  
 शुनां तत्त्वदृशाञ्चैव को भेदोऽशुचिभक्षणे ॥ इति ॥

ब्रह्मवित्त्वं तथा मुक्ता स आत्मज्ञो न चेतरे इति च ॥ १५५ ॥

155. Just as the modes of eating, relaxation, and so forth that existed before this one's attainment of knowledge continue, so do his auspicious latent impressions, or he becomes indifferent to both auspicious and inauspicious latencies. That is said:

<sup>83</sup>I have not been able to find a reference for this statement in any of my sources.



If one awakened to the non-dual truth acted with abandon,  
What difference would there be between such persons and dogs  
In the matter of eating unclean things? (*Naiṣkarmya-siddhi*, 4.621)

and

One who has given up being “a knower of Brahman”  
Is a [true] knower of Self, not any other. (*Upadeśa-sāhasrī*, 115)

तदानीममानित्वादीनि ज्ञानसाधनान्यद्वेष्टत्वादयः सद्गुणाश्चालङ्कारवद-  
नुवर्तन्ते । तदुक्तम्

उत्पन्नात्मावबोधस्य ह्यद्वेष्टत्वादयो गुणाः ।  
अयत्नतो भवन्त्यस्य न तु साधनरूपिणः ॥ इति ॥ १५६ ॥

156. Then the prerequisites of knowledge, not being conceited and so forth, and the good qualities, such as not being hateful and so forth, follow like ornaments. That is said:

For one who has awakened to the Self  
The qualities, headed by freedom from hate,  
Appear without any effort,  
Not through cultivation. (*Naiṣkarmya-siddhi*, 4.69)

किं बहुना अयं देहयात्रामात्रार्थमिच्छानिच्छापरेच्छाप्रापितानि सुख-  
दुःखलक्षणान्यारब्धफलान्यनुभवन्नन्तःकरणाभासादीनामवभासकः स-  
न्तदवसाने प्रत्यगानन्दपरब्रह्मणि प्राणे लीने सत्यज्ञानतत्कार्यसंस्का-  
राणामपि विनाशात्परमकैवल्यमानन्दैकरसमखिलभेदप्रतिभासरहित-  
मखण्डब्रह्मावतिष्ठते । न तस्य प्राणा उत्क्रामन्ति, अत्रैव समवलीयन्ते  
विमुक्तश्च विमुच्यत इत्यादिश्रुतेः ॥ १५७ ॥

157. What need is there for more [discussion]? This one while experienc-  
ing the results that have already begun which were brought about by de-  
sire, want of desire, or the desire of others, consisting of happiness and dis-  
tress, for only as long as his body remains, becomes the illuminator of the

semblance of an internal organ, and so forth; and when that ends and his life force is dissolved in the highest Brahman which is internal joy, then following the destruction of ignorance and its effects, [namely] the latent impressions, only unbroken Brahman, the highest singularity, the same as joy [bliss], free of all appearance of distinction remains. [This is known] from revealed texts such as: “Nor do his life forces pass on” (*Bṛhad-āraṇyaka U.*, 4.4.6), “Into this indeed do they dissolve” (*Bṛhad-āraṇyaka U.*, 3.2.11), and “The liberated one is liberated” (*Kaṭha U.*, 5.1).

Thus ends the Essentials of Vedānta (*Vedānta-sāra*)  
of Sadānanda Yogīndra.

## Part II

प्रमेयरत्नावली

(Prameya-ratnāvalī)

**Text Two: The Necklace of  
Truth-Jewels**



# Chapter 1

## First Truth-Jewel: Hari is Supreme

जयति श्रीगोविन्दो गोपीनाथः स मदनगोपालः ।  
वक्ष्यामि यस्य कृपया प्रमेयरत्नावलीं सूक्ष्माम् ॥ १ ॥

1. Victory to Śrī Govinda, Gopīnātha [lord of the cowherd girls, the gopīs], Madanagopāla [the intoxicating cowherd]. I shall by his grace present the concise *Necklace of Truth-Jewels*.<sup>1</sup>

भक्त्याभासेनापि तोषं दधाने  
धर्माध्यक्षे विश्वनिस्तारिनाम्नि ।  
नित्यानन्दाद्वैतचैतन्यरूपे  
तत्त्वे तस्मिन्नित्यमास्तां रतिर्नः ॥ २ ॥

2. May our attraction always stay fixed on that [ultimate] truth who is pleased by even the semblance of *bhakti*,<sup>2</sup> the overseer of *dharma*, whose

---

<sup>1</sup>By double entendre, the three major images of the Caitanya Vaiṣṇava tradition are praised in this verse. They are Govinda, Gopīnātha, and Madanamohana. Govinda is the image of Kṛṣṇa that was discovered and worshiped by Rūpa Gosvāmin, Gopīnātha by Madhu Paṇḍita, and Madanamohana by Sanātana Gosvāmin.

<sup>2</sup>I have tended to leave the Sanskrit term *bhakti* in this translation. Though it is often translated as “devotion,” that meaning applies only to some parts of the linguistic horizon of the Sanskrit term. The discussion that follows will elucidate some of the various meanings the term has.

name delivers the world, whose form is eternal joy, without duality, and consciousness.<sup>3</sup>

आनन्दतीर्थनामा सुखमयधामा यतिर्जीयात् ।  
संसारार्णवतरणिं यमिह जनाः कीर्तयन्ति बुधाः ॥ ३ ॥

3. May the ascetic named Ānandatīrtha, a bastion of joy, whom the wise praise as a lifeboat in the ocean of transmigration, be victorious.<sup>4</sup>

भवति विचिन्त्या विदुषां  
निरवकरा गुरुपरम्परा नित्यम् ।  
एकान्तित्वं सिध्यति ययो-  
दयति येन हरितोषः ॥ ४ ॥

4. The faultless chain of teachers is to be meditated on by the wise; by it single-mindedness is achieved and by that Hari's [Kṛṣṇa's] satisfaction arises.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup>This is a multivalent stanza that can be read in several ways. By one reading, this stanza appears to glorify the non-dual absolute of Advaita Vedānta. That absolute is eternal, blissful, and non-dual consciousness. Since that form of Vedānta will be refuted by the author in this work, his use of that terminology here is playfully taunting. An alternative interpretation praises the Supreme Self, since the word *tattva* means a thing's own or true nature or the Supreme Self (paramātmān) according to the traditional Sanskrit lexicon, the *Viśva-kośa*. That Supreme Self, in this tradition Kṛṣṇa, has an eternally joyful form that is non-dual, there being no difference between body and embodied in his case, and that is consciousness. He oversees the performance of *dharma*, that is, religious duty, is pleased even with a mere semblance of devotion, and has names that can deliver the whole world. A third meaning points to the Supreme Self that appeared recently, in the Age of Kali, in the forms of Nityānanda, Advaita, and Caitanya. This refers to Caitanya, the founder of the tradition and his main colleagues Nityānanda and Advaita.

<sup>4</sup>This refers to Madhvācārya, whom Baladeva regarded as one of the great teachers of the Vaiṣṇava community that the Caitanya tradition belongs to.

<sup>5</sup>The very first thing to be established by a religious/philosophical school is an authoritative source for its teachings. A school's teachings are referred to as *prameya* which means those truths that are demonstrated by the accepted means of knowing (*pramāṇa*). Not all schools agree on which of those means are acceptable, but they do agree on what those means of knowing are. As we shall see in the last chapter of this text, the three most important means are direct perception (*pratyakṣa*), inference (*anumāna*), and testimony (*śābda*). This discussion of traditions or communities (*sampradāya*) is intended to establish the validity of the third of these means of correct knowledge. To the question

यदुक्तं पद्मपुराणे :

सम्प्रदायविहीना ये मन्त्रास्ते विफला मताः  
अतः कलौ भविष्यन्ति चत्वारः सम्प्रदायिनः ।  
श्रीब्रह्मरुद्रसनका वैष्णवाः क्षितिपावनाः  
चत्वारस्ते कलौ भाव्या ह्युत्कले पुरुषोत्तमात् ॥ (क) ॥

4a. As said in the *Padma Purāṇa*:

Mantras that are without a community [of transmission]<sup>6</sup> are considered fruitless. Therefore, in the Age of Kali there will be four founders of traditions: Śrī, Brahmā, Rudra, and Sanaka, who are earth-purifying devotees of Viṣṇu.<sup>7</sup> Those four shall certainly appear in the Age of Kali from Puruṣottama [Jagannātha] in Orissa.

रामानुजं श्रीः स्वीचक्रे मध्वाचार्यं चतुर्मुखः ।  
श्रीविष्णुस्वामिनं रुद्रो निम्बादित्यं चतुःसनः ॥ (ख) ॥

4b. Śrī [Lakṣmī] accepted Rāmānuja; the four-faced one [Brahmā] [accepted] Madhvācārya; Rudra [accepted] Viṣṇusvāmin; and the four Sanas [accepted] Nimbāditya.<sup>8</sup>

तत्र स्वगुरुपरम्परा यथा :

श्रीकृष्णब्रह्मदेवर्षिबादरायणसंज्ञकान् ।

“what is the source of these truths about to be presented?” the answer is the testimony of our tradition or line of authoritative transmitters of those truths. Thus, the unspoken assumption of this and other religious traditions is that authoritative testimony outweighs direct perception and inference when it comes to knowing ultimate truths.

<sup>6</sup>Community means here an unbroken line of teachers that pass on the teachings or sacred *mantra*. Mantra or verbal formula used in ritual are believed to have no power unless they are received from one of the accepted communities of transmission by means of a ritual of initiation (*dīkṣā*).

<sup>7</sup>Those are the four major Vaiṣṇava communities that were influential at the time of Baladeva. They are all still active in India today.

<sup>8</sup>Nimbāditya is another name for Nimbārka.

श्रीमध्वश्रीपद्मनाभश्रीमन्नहरिमाधवान् ॥  
 अक्षोभ्यजयतीर्थश्रीज्ञानसिन्धुदयानिधीन् ।  
 श्रीविद्यानिधिराजेन्द्रजयधर्मान् क्रमाद्वयम् ॥  
 पुरुषोत्तमब्रह्मण्यव्यासतीर्थाश्च संस्तुमः ।  
 ततो लक्ष्मीपतिं श्रीमन्माधवेन्द्रं च भक्तिः ॥  
 तच्छिष्यान् श्रीश्वराद्वैतनित्यानन्दान् जगद्गुरुन् ॥  
 देवमीश्वरशिष्यं श्रीचैतन्यञ्च भजामहे ।  
 श्रीकृष्णप्रेमदानेन येन निस्तारितं जगत् ॥ (ग) ॥

4c. Among them, our own succession of teachers is thus: We praise in succession Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Brahmā, Devarṣi, Bādarāyaṇa, Madhva, Padmanābha, Nṛhari, Mādhava, Akṣobhya, Jayatīrtha, Jñānasindhu, Dayānidhi, Vidyānidhi, Rājendra, Jayadharman, and also Puruṣottama, Brahmanya, and Vyāsatīrtha. Then we worship with devotion Lakṣmīpati, Mādhavendra, his disciples — Īśvara [Purī], Advaita, and Nityānanda, world teachers all — and the deity [himself], the disciple of Īśvara, Śrī Caitanya, by whom, through the gift of love for Kṛṣṇa, the world has been saved.

अथ प्रमेयाण्युद्दिश्यन्ते:

श्रीमध्वः प्राह विष्णुं परतममखिलाम्नायवेद्यञ्च विश्वं  
 सत्यं भेदञ्च जीवान् हरिचरणजुषस्तारतम्यञ्च तेषाम् ।  
 मोक्षं विष्णवद्विलाभं तदमलभजनं तस्य हेतुं प्रमाणं  
 प्रत्यक्षादित्रयं चेत्युपदिशति हरिः कृष्णचैतन्यचन्द्रः ॥ ५  
 ॥

Now the truths are indicated:

5. The moonlike Kṛṣṇacaitanya, who is Hari, teaches thus: Madhva taught that Viṣṇu is supreme and the subject of all sacred texts, the world and difference are real, living beings are servants at the feet of Hari, there is a hierarchy among them, liberation is the attainment of the feet of Viṣṇu, untainted worship of him is [its] cause, and the means of valid knowledge



are the three headed by direct perception.<sup>9</sup>

तत्र श्रीविष्णोः परमत्वं यथा श्रीगोपालोपनिषदि :

तस्मात् कृष्ण एव परो देवस्तं द्यायेत्तं रसेत्तं भजेत्तं यजेत्  
॥ (क) ॥

Among those [truths], Viṣṇu's supremacy as in the *Gopālatāpanī Upaniṣad*:

5a. Therefore, Kṛṣṇa alone is the supreme deity. One should meditate on him, savor him, worship him, offer to him.

श्वेताश्वतरोपनिषदि च :

ज्ञात्वा देवं सर्वपाशापहानिः  
क्षीणैः क्लेशैर्जन्ममृत्युप्रहाणिः ।  
तस्याभिध्यानात्तृतीयं देहभेदे  
विश्वैश्वर्यं केवलमाप्तकामः ॥ (ख) ॥ (श्वे. उ., १.११)  
एतज्ज्ञेयं नित्यमेवात्मसंस्थं  
नातः परं वेदितव्यं हि किञ्चित् ॥ (ग) ॥  
(श्वे. उ., १.१२)

And in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (1.11-12):

5b. After knowing the deity, all fetters are destroyed. With the withering of afflictions,<sup>10</sup> birth and death are destroyed. From meditation on him, at the end of the body [one reaches] the third [abode],<sup>11</sup> which is full of opulence and whole,<sup>12</sup> and one has all desires fulfilled.

<sup>9</sup>That is, direct perception (*pratyakṣa*), inference (*anumāna*), and testimony (*āpta* or *śābda*).

<sup>10</sup>The afflictions (*kleśa*) are ignorance, egoism, anger, hatred, and clinging. These are described in the *Yoga-sūtra* of Patañjali.

<sup>11</sup>The third abode is an abode beyond the moon and the world of Brahmā, both of which are places where those returning to the world in future lives go after death. The third abode is thus believed to be beyond birth and death; it is the world of the Lord.

<sup>12</sup>Whole (*kevala*) means single, simple or pure, unmixed with heterogenous or foreign elements.

5c. This one is to be known, the eternal situated in the self. Beyond this, nothing at all is to be known.

श्रीगीतासु च:

मत्तः परतरं नान्यत्किञ्चिदस्ति धनञ्जय ॥ (घ) ॥ (भ.  
गी., ३.३)

And in the *Bhagavad-gītā* (3.3):

5d. There is nothing higher than me, O Dhanañjaya [Arjuna]!

हेतुत्वाद्विभुचैतन्यानन्दत्वादिगुणाश्रयात् ।  
नित्यलक्ष्म्यादिमत्त्वाच्च कृष्णः परतमो मतः ॥ ६ ॥

6. Kṛṣṇa is considered supreme because of being the cause [of all],<sup>13</sup> the ground of qualities like all-pervasiveness, consciousness, joy, etc., the possessor of the eternal Lakṣmī,<sup>14</sup> and so forth.

तत्र सर्वहेतुत्वं यथाहुः श्वेताश्वतराः:

एकः स देवो भगवान् वरेण्यो  
योनिस्वभावानधितिष्ठत्येकः ॥ (क) ॥ (श्वे. उ., ५.४)

यच्च स्वभावं पचति विश्वयोनिः  
पाच्यांश्च सर्वान् परिणामयेद्यः ॥ (ख) ॥ (श्वे. उ., ५.५)

<sup>13</sup>Kṛṣṇa is the cause of the manifest world because he is both its instrumental and material cause. He is the instrumental cause through his supreme power (*parā-śakti*), that is also known as his internal (*antaraṅga-śakti*) or constitutional power (*svarūpa-śakti*), and he is the material cause through his primordial or originating power (*pradhāna-śakti*), also known as his external power (*bahiraṅga-śakti*). His witnessing power (*kṣetra-jñā-śakti*), also known as his intermediate power (*taṭastha-śakti*) is expressed as all living beings. This doctrine of the three powers of the supreme is based on a passage from the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (6.7.61) cited later in this text.

<sup>14</sup>Lakṣmī is the goddess of wealth and good fortune and is considered to be the eternal consort of Viṣṇu.

Among those, [his] being the cause of all, as the sage of the *Śvetāśvatara* (5.4-5) says:

6a. That one deity, the lord who is to be worshiped, alone oversees the natures [effects] and the causes [of the world].

6b. And who, the cause of the universe, ripens nature and transforms all things to be ripened.

विभुचैतन्यानन्दत्वं यथा काठकेः

महान्तं विभुमात्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति ॥ (ग) ॥  
(क. उ., ४.४)

[His] all-pervasiveness, consciousness, and joy as [found] in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* (4.4):

6c. Reflecting on the great and all-pervading Self, the wise man does not lament.<sup>15</sup>

विज्ञानसुखरूपत्वमात्मशब्देन बोध्यते ।  
अनेन मुक्तगम्यत्वव्यूत्पत्तेरिति तद्विदः ॥ ७ ॥

7. His having a form of consciousness and joy is understood by this word “Self” (*ātman*) [in the previous citation] because of its derivation “attained by the liberated.” So say those who know.<sup>16</sup>

वाजसनेयिनश्चाहुः:

<sup>15</sup>Akṣaya Kumāra Śāstrī interprets “he does not lament” to mean that he does not embrace sorrow (*śoka*) which in the larger sense means the sorrow of transmigration. That is, the wise man spoken of in this passage is freed from the cycle of transmigration. Kṛṣṇadeva understands “reflecting on” to mean “knowing and worshiping.”

<sup>16</sup>The derivation referred to here is: *atyate labhyate muktaiḥ* “he [it] is attained by the liberated.” According to Kṛṣṇadeva the *man* ending (*manin*) in *ātman* indicates the object of the action of the verb *atati*, that is, the object that is attained. This verse answers the question raised about the previous citation which is held to demonstrate the all-pervasiveness, consciousness, and joy of Kṛṣṇa. The all-pervasiveness is directly stated in the passage with the word *vibhu*. Consciousness and joy come from the word *ātman*.

विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म रातिर्दातुः परायणम् ॥ (क) ॥ (बृ.  
उ., ३.९.२८.७)

The Vājasaneyin [that is, the sage Yājñavalkya in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*] (3.9.28.7) said:

7a. Brahman is consciousness and joy, the giver of results to the giver, the highest resort [of the knower of Brahman].<sup>17</sup>

श्रीगोपालोपनिषदि च :

तमेकं गोविन्दं सच्चिदानन्दविग्रहम् ॥ (ख) ॥

And in the *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad*:

7b. That one who is Govinda [Kṛṣṇa] is the embodiment of eternal existence, consciousness, and joy.

मूर्तत्वं प्रतिपत्तव्यं चित्सुखस्यैव रागवत् ।  
विज्ञानघनशब्दादिकीर्तनाच्चापि तस्य तत् ।  
देहदेहिभिदा नास्तीत्येतेनैवोपदर्शितम् ॥ ८ ॥

8. Consciousness' and joy's possession of form is to be grasped by analogy with musical modes (*rāga*)<sup>18</sup> and also, because of the proclamation [in scripture] with words like "concentrated consciousness," his possession of form [is established].<sup>19</sup> By this it is shown tangentially that there is no

<sup>17</sup>The portion in brackets is supplied from the rest of the verse in the *Upaniṣad* (*tiṣṭhamānasya tadvidah*).

<sup>18</sup>The melody analogy is a bit difficult to grasp and this may be a cultural problem. Both commentators say that just as a musical mode's form is perceived in an ear saturated by musical experience so is Kṛṣṇa's form perceived by a mind imbued with devotion. According to a traditional verse on classical Indian musical theory there are six major musical modes out of which musical compositions are created. These are: Bhairava, Kauśika, Hindola, Dīpaka, Śrīrāga, and Megharāga.

<sup>19</sup>The reference here is to a passage in the *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad*, which is considered a revealed text (*śruti*) in this tradition. The passage is: *vijñāna-ghana ānanda-ghanah sac-cid-ānandaikarase bhakti-yoge tiṣṭhati* (2.89). It means: "he who is solidified consciousness and solidified joy is situated in the yoga of bhakti which is the same as eternal existence, consciousness, and joy". The word *ghana* here means "solidified" or "condensed." Our commentator Kṛṣṇadeva Vedāntavāgīśa points out that according to the grammarian Pāṇini *ghana* means form or image (*mūrti*).

distinction between the embodied and the body [in his case].<sup>20</sup>

मूर्तत्वस्यैव विभुत्वं यथा श्वेताश्वतरोपनिषदि :

वृक्ष इव स्तब्धो दिवि तिष्ठत्येकस्  
तेनेदं पूर्णं पुरुषेण सर्वम् ॥ (क) ॥ (श्वे. उ., ३.९)

His all-pervasiveness, even though he has form, as in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (3.9):

8a. The one stands in heaven, erect like a tree.  
By that person is all this filled.<sup>21</sup>

द्युस्थोऽपि निखिलव्यापीत्याख्यानान्मूर्तिमान् विभुः ।  
युगपद्घातवृन्देषु साक्षात्काराच्च तादृशः ॥ ९ ॥

9. From the statement: “though situated in the heavens he pervades everything,” [we see that] he [both] has form and is all-pervading. He is also that way because he is present simultaneously to many meditators.

श्रीदशमे च :

न चान्तर्बहिर्यस्य न पूर्वं नापि चापरम् ।  
पूर्वापरं बहिश्चान्तर्जगतो यो जगच्च यः ॥  
तं मत्वात्मजमव्यक्तं मर्त्यलिङ्गमधोक्षजम् ।  
गोपिकोलूखले दाम्ना बबन्ध प्राकृतं यथा ॥ (क) ॥ (भा.  
पु., १०.९.१३-१४)

<sup>20</sup>This is an extremely important aspect of Vaiṣṇava Vedānta. Though Kṛṣṇa has form there is no difference between his body and his self. The situation that is believed to hold among ordinary, embodied beings is that of a duality. The living beings are consciousness and are distinct from their bodies which are formed of the five material elements.

<sup>21</sup>The question raised here is: if the Lord has form then how can he be all-pervading? To have form means to be limited by certain measurements or boundaries. The verse from the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* suggests an example in the form of a tree which above ground assumes a fixed form and beneath ground pervades the earth with its root system.

And in the Tenth Canto [of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*] (10.9.13-14):

9a. Him of whom there is no inner or outer, no before and after, who is the before and after, the outer and inner of the universe, who is the universe. Thinking him her son, though he is the unmanifest, beyond sensory experience, in mortal form, the cowherd woman tied him to a wooden mortar like an ordinary boy.<sup>22</sup>

श्रीगीतासु च:

मया ततमिदं सर्वं जगदव्यक्तमूर्तिना ।  
 मत्स्थानि सर्वभातानि न चाहं तेष्ववस्थितः ॥ (भ. गी.,  
 ९.४)  
 न च मत्स्थानि भूतानि पश्य मे योगमैश्वरम् ॥ (ख) ॥  
 (भ. गी., ९.५)

And in the *Bhagavad-gītā* (9.4-5):

9b. I am spread through all this universe with my unmanifest form. All beings are in me, but I am not in them. Nor, too, are the beings situated in me. See my godly power.

अनन्त्या शक्तिरस्तीशे योगशब्देन योच्यते ।  
 विरोधभञ्जिका सा स्यादिति तत्त्वविदां मतम् ॥ १० ॥

10. What is meant by the word *yoga* ["power" in the previous verse] is that there is unlimited power in the lord which is the resolver of contradictions.<sup>23</sup> This is the opinion of the wise.

आदिना सर्वज्ञत्वं यथा मुण्डके:

<sup>22</sup>This is a mythological example of Kṛṣṇa's being simultaneously everywhere and localized. Kṛṣṇa's mother Yaśodā ties him to a wooden mortar for misbehaving. He is thus represented as circumscribed and unlimited at the same time.

<sup>23</sup>Kṛṣṇadeva interprets the word *yoga* in the previous verse as "that which is employed in difficult-to-accomplish tasks, i.e. *yoga* is inconceivable power." This word is not to be taken as the discipline of *yoga* taught by Patañjali here. The *yoga* here is more akin to *prayoga* or application, the application of one's force or skill to a task in order to get it done. One of the contradictions the author has in mind here is Kṛṣṇa's being both all-pervading and circumscribed by form.

यः सर्वज्ञः सर्ववित् ॥ (क) ॥ (मु. उ., १.१.९, २.२.७)

By “etc.” [in verse 6] is meant omniscience as in the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (1.1.9; 2.2.7):

10a. ... who is all-knowing, all comprehending.<sup>24</sup>

आनन्दित्वं च तैत्तिरीयकेः

आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान्न विभेति कुतश्चन ॥ (ख) ॥ (तै.  
उ., २.९.१)

And being joyful in the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*:

10b. One who knows the joy of Brahman has no fear of anything.<sup>25</sup>

प्रभुत्वसुहृत्त्वज्ञानदत्वमोचकत्वानि च श्वेताश्वतरश्रुतौः

सर्वस्य प्रभुमीशानं सर्वस्य शरणं सुहृत् ॥ (ग) ॥ (श्वे.  
उ., ३.१७)

And his being the master, the friend, the giver of knowledge, and the liberator as [found] in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*:

10c. ... the master of all, the controller, the resort of all, the friend.

प्रज्ञा च तस्मात् प्रसृता पुराणी ॥ (घ) ॥ (श्वे. उ.,  
४.१४)

10d. From him ancient wisdom is manifested.

<sup>24</sup>The two words *sarva-jña* and *sarva-vit* both meaning “all-knowing.” Akṣaya Kumāra Śāstrī says in his commentary that the first means knowing everything in general and the second means knowing all things in particular.

<sup>25</sup>Both commentators note that the joy referred to here is joy as a quality as opposed to the joy that is Kṛṣṇa’s very nature described previously. Though Kṛṣṇa is joy by nature, he is characterized by having eternal joy.

संसारमोक्षस्थितिवन्धहेतुः ॥ (ङ) ॥ (श्वे. उ., ६.१६)

10e. ... the cause of liberation from, maintenance of, and bondage to trans-migratory existence.

माधुर्यञ्च श्रीगोपालोपनिषदिः

सत्पुण्डरीकनयनं मेघाभं वैद्युताम्बरम् ।  
द्विभुजं ज्ञानमुद्राढ्यं वनमालिनमीश्वरम् ॥ (च) ॥ (गो.  
ता. उ., पूर्व १०)

And [his] sweetness in the *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad*:

10f. [Meditating on] the lord who has lotus-like eyes, [complexion] the color of a cloud, clothes the color of lightning, two arms, the posture of knowledge, a garland of forest flowers, [one becomes liberated from worldly existence].<sup>26</sup>

न भिन्ना धर्मिणो धर्मा भेदभानं विशेषतः ।

यस्मात् कालः सर्वदास्तीत्यादिधीर्विदुषामपि ॥ ११ ॥

11. The characteristics are not distinguishable from the one characterized, [but] there is the appearance of distinction because of *viśeṣa*, since even among the learned there are notions such as “time always exists.”<sup>27</sup>

एवमुक्तं नारदपञ्चरात्रेः

<sup>26</sup>Sweetness is defined by Kṛṣṇadeva as the performing of actions in a human form that can be accomplished only by supreme power. As an example he gives Kṛṣṇa’s sucking on the breast of the witch Putanā like an ordinary child, and yet sucking out her life and giving her liberation by doing so.

<sup>27</sup>The question addressed here is whether all the characteristics discussed so far are different from Viṣṇu or non-different from him. If they are different from him then they do not accord with some statements of revealed scripture, *Kaṭha U.*, 4.14, for instance, “the one who sees the traits as separate chases after them,” and if they are non-different then the non-qualified absolute which is denied in this tradition is supported. The answer is that all the characteristics are not really different from Viṣṇu, but appear to be so through the action of *viśeṣa*. *Viśeṣa* means “distinctive” or “peculiar attribute.” Here it is defined by both commentators as the “surrogate” of difference, but not (real) difference (विशेषश्च भेदप्रतिनिधिर्न भेदः). This idea is different from the category of the same name in Nyāya (Indian Logic) that serves to distinguish eternal substances and atomic particles



निर्दोषपूर्णगुणविग्रह आत्मतन्त्रो  
 निश्चेतनात्मकशरीरगुणैश्च हीनः ।  
 आनन्दमात्रकरपादमुखोदरादिः  
 सर्वत्र च स्वगतभेदविवर्जितात्मा ॥ (क) ॥

So is it said in the *Nāradapañcarātra*:

11a. He has a faultless figure, full of qualities, and is self-reliant, devoid of an unconscious body and qualities, is possessed of hands, feet, face, and abdomen of pure joy and is in all ways free of internal distinctions.<sup>28</sup>

अथ नित्यलक्ष्मीकत्वं यथा विष्णुपुराणे:

नित्यैव सा जगन्माता विष्णोः श्रीरनपायिनी  
 यथा सर्वगतो विष्णुस्तथैवेयं द्विजोत्तम ॥ (ख) ॥

Then, his always being connected with Lakṣmī, as [is stated] in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (1.8.15):

11b. She is indeed eternal, the mother of the world, that unfailing Śrī [goddess of wealth] of Viṣṇu. Just as Viṣṇu is all-pervading, so indeed is she, O best of the twice born.

विष्णोः स्युः शक्तयस्तिष्ठस्तासु या कीर्तिता परा ।  
 सैव श्रीस्तदभिन्नेति प्राह शिष्यान् प्रभुर्महान् ॥ १२ ॥

from each other. In Nyāya a *viśeṣa* is what makes two atomic particles that are otherwise indistinguishable different. Here, however, a *viśeṣa* causes the perception of difference where there is no difference. The examples are “time always is” and “existence exists.” By attributing time to time or existence to existence the statements create the appearance of difference between the subject and predicate when in fact there is no difference.

<sup>28</sup>There are three kinds of difference. The first is difference among things of the same type (*sajātīya-bheda*) like the difference between a mango and a jack-fruit. The second is difference between things of different types (*vijātīya-bheda*) like the difference between a mango and a stone. Lastly, there is internal (*svagata*) difference like the difference between the flowers and fruit of the mango tree. In Viṣṇu’s case there is no internal difference between him and his body or him and his qualities.

12. Viṣṇu has three energies. The one among them who is proclaimed as the highest is Śrī, who is not different from him. So taught the great master to his disciples.

तत्र त्रिशक्तिर्विष्णुः यथा श्वेताश्वतरोपनिषदि :

परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते  
स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च ॥ (क) ॥

In this, Viṣṇu's three energies, as [described] in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (6.8):

12a. His higher energy, which is innate to him, is described variously as knowledge, strength, and activity.

प्रधानक्षेत्रज्ञपतिर्गुणेशः ॥ (ख) ॥

and:

12b. ... the master of primordial matter and of the knower of the field [the living being], the controller of the *guṇa*. (Śvet. U., 6.16)

श्रीविष्णुपुराणे च :

विष्णुशक्तिः परा प्रोक्ता क्षेत्रज्ञाख्या तथाऽपरा ।  
अविद्याकर्मसंज्ञाऽन्या तृतीया शक्तिरिष्यते ॥ (ग) ॥ (वि.  
पु., ६.७.६१)

And in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (6.7.61):

12c. Viṣṇu's energy is proclaimed as higher as well as lower, called the 'knower of the field;' [and] another, a third energy, is accepted called ignorance and action (*karman*).

परैव विष्णवभिन्ना श्रीरित्युक्तं तत्रैव (वि. पु., १.९.४४ - ४५):

कलाकाष्ठानिमेषादिकालसूत्रस्य गोचरे ।  
 यस्य शक्तिर्न शुद्धस्य प्रसीदतु स नो हरिः ॥  
 प्रोच्यते परमेशो यः यः शुद्धोऽप्युपचारतः ।  
 प्रसीदतु स नो विष्णुरात्मा यः सर्वदेहिनाम् ॥ (घ) ॥

That the “higher” [power] is Śrī who is non-different from Viṣṇu is stated there [in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (1.9.44-45)] as well:

12d. May Hari be pleased with us, the pure one whose power is not under the control of time which is made up of units like *kalā*, *kāṣṭhā*, *nimeṣa*, and so forth.<sup>29</sup> He, though pure, is said metaphorically to be the Lord of Śrī (*paramā*);<sup>30</sup> may that Viṣṇu, who is the Self of all embodied beings, be pleased with us.

एषा परैव त्रिवृदित्यप्युक्तं तत्रैव (वि. पु., १.१२.६९)

ह्लादिनी सन्धिनी संवित्त्वय्येका सर्वसंश्रये ।  
 ह्लादतापकरी मिश्रा त्वयि नो गुणवर्जिते ॥ (ङ) ॥

That this “higher” [power] is threefold is also stated there (1.12.69) as well:

12e. The giver of pleasure, the supporter of being, and the bringer of awareness are one in you, who are refuge of all. The mixed one which causes pleasure and pain is not in you who are free of the *guṇa*.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>29</sup>These are some of the units into which time is divided. This statement implies that since Viṣṇu’s power does not fall under the influence of time, because it is not different from him, it is eternal as he is eternal.

<sup>30</sup>The question posed and answered by this statement is that if Viṣṇu is said to be pure, that is unmixed or undivided, then how can he be called the lord of Śrī? If Viṣṇu and Śrī are non-different, how can one of them be said to be the lord of the other? The author of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* says that such statements are to be taken metaphorically only. The *Purāṇa*, then, supports the non-difference of Viṣṇu and Śrī and is thus cited by the author of this text as an authority for his assertion of that non-difference.

<sup>31</sup>The three higher or internal powers of Kṛṣṇa are the pleasure-giving (*hlādinī*), being-giving (*sandhinī*), and the awareness-giving (*saṁvit*). The pleasure-giving power is, according to Kṛṣṇadeva, that by which one who is pleasure enjoys. The being-giving power is that by which the one who is existence embraces existence. She is the cause of the deity’s pervasion through all times and places. The awareness-giving power is that by which the being who is awareness becomes aware. Kṛṣṇadeva goes on to say that this power is really one, but is distinguished into three by the particular force appearing in its effects.

एकोऽपि विष्णुरेकापि लक्ष्मीस्तदनपायिनी ।  
स्वसिद्धैर्बहुभिर्वेशैर्बहुरित्यभिधीयते ॥ १३ ॥

13. Though Viṣṇu is one and Lakṣmī, inseparable from him, is also one, they are said to be many through their many self-accomplished garbs.<sup>32</sup>

तत्रैकत्वे सत्येव विष्णोर्बहुत्वं, यथा श्रीगोपालोपनिषदि (गो. ता. उ., पूर्व २०):

एको वशी सर्वगः कृष्ण ईड्य  
एकोऽपि सन् बहुधा योऽवभाति ।  
तं पीठस्थं ये तु यजन्ति धीरास्  
तेषां सुखं शाश्वतं नेतरेषाम् ॥ (क) ॥

On Viṣṇu's being many while yet being one, as in the *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* (1.20):

13a. The one, controller, all-pervading is Kṛṣṇa, who is worshipable and who though one appears as many. Those steadfast ones who worship him on the altar will have enduring happiness, not others.

अथ लक्ष्म्यास्तद् यथा:

परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते ॥ (ख) ॥ (श्वे. उ., ९.८)

Now the same for Lakṣmī, for instance (Śvet. U., 9.8):

13b. The higher innate energy of this one is heard of as manifold.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>32</sup>Kṛṣṇadeva quotes a passage from the *Nārada-pañcarātra* in which it is said:

Just as the jewel in different parts is blue, yellow, and so forth and thus assumes different forms, so does the Lord assume different forms through different types of meditation.

The jewel referred to here, he says, is a Vaidurya jewel which from different angles appears to be blue, yellow, and so forth. Thus though the highest truth is one, it appears as two, as the highest male and as the highest female.

<sup>33</sup>The whole verse is cited earlier at 12c.

पूर्तिः सार्वत्रिकी यद्यप्यविशेषा तथापि हि ।  
तारतम्यञ्च तच्छक्तिव्यक्त्यव्यक्तिकृतं भवेत् ॥ १४ ॥

14. Although the fullness is the same in all [the divine forms] without distinction, still there may be a hierarchy created by the manifestation or non-manifestation of their power.<sup>34</sup>

तत्र विष्णोः सार्वत्रिकी पूर्तिर्यथा वाजसनेयके (बृ. उ., ५.१.१):

पूर्णमदः पूर्णमिदं पूर्णात् पूर्णमुदच्यते ।  
पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते ॥ (क) ॥

Thus the fullness of Viṣṇu in all [forms], as in the *Vājasaneyaka* (*Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, 5.1.1):

14a. That is full; this is full. From the full the full arises. Taking away the full of the full, the full alone remains.

महावाराहे च:

सर्वे नित्याः शाश्वताश्च देहास्तस्य परात्मनः ।  
हानोपादानरहिता नैव प्रकृतिजाः क्वचित् ॥  
परमानन्दसन्दोहा ज्ञानमात्राश्च सर्वतः ।  
सर्वे सर्वगुणैः पूर्णाः सर्वदोषविवर्जिताः ॥ (ख) ॥

And in the *Varāha Purāṇa*:

14b. All the bodies of that supreme self are eternal and everlasting, free of loss or gain, never born of nature, full of the highest joy, and always fully aware. All are full of all qualities and free of all flaws.

अथ श्रियः सा यथा श्रीविष्णुपुराणे (वि. पु., १.९.१४०-१४३):

<sup>34</sup>All of the various forms or descents (*avatāra*) of Viṣṇu and Lakṣmī are full or complete. Nevertheless, they differ in terms of how much or how many of their qualities they manifest.

एवं यथा जगत्स्वामी देवदेवो जनार्दनः ।  
 अवतारं करोत्येष तथा श्रीस्तदसहायिनी ॥  
 पुनश्च पद्मादुद्भूता आदित्योऽभूद्यदा हरिः ।  
 यदा च भार्गवो रामस्तदाभूद्वरणी त्वियम् ॥  
 राघवत्वेऽभवत् सीता रुक्मिणी कृष्णजन्मनि ।  
 अन्येषु चावतारेषु विष्णोरेषा सहायिनी ॥  
 देवत्वे देवदेहेयं मनुष्यत्वे च मानुषी ।  
 विष्णोर्देहानुरूपां वै करोत्येषात्मनस्तनुम् ॥ (ग) ॥

Now that of Śrī, as in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (1.9.140-143):

14c. Thus as the Master of the Universe, the god of gods, Janārdana, makes descents, so does his companion Śrī. And again, when Hari became the son of Aditi, she was born from the lotus.<sup>35</sup> And when Rāma, the descendent of Bhṛgu, was born this one became the Earth.<sup>36</sup> When he was Rāma, she became Sītā; in Kṛṣṇa's birth she was Rukmīṇī. And in the other descents of Viṣṇu, she was his companion. When he is a god she has a goddess' body and when he is a man, she is woman. She fashions her own body according to the body of Viṣṇu.

स्यात् स्वरूपसती पूर्तिरिहैक्यादिति विन्मतम् ॥ १५ ॥

15. The opinion of the learned is that because of the oneness here [among all of these descents] there should be an essential fullness [in all of them].

अथ तथापि तारतम्यम्

तत्र श्रीविष्णोस्तद् यथा श्रीभागवते (भा. पु., १.३.२८):

एते चांशकलाः पुंसः कृष्णस्तु भगवान् स्वयम् ॥ (क) ॥

<sup>35</sup>The "son of Aditi" means the Vāmana or "dwarf" descent of Viṣṇu. His consort, born out of a lotus, was known as Padmā. Āditya is also a name for the sun and Vāmana's three steps have been recognized as the course of the sun by some scholars. The sun's romantic relationship with the lotus flower (lotus flowers blossom during the day) has been stuff of Sanskrit poetry for centuries.

<sup>36</sup>The son of Bhṛgu is Paraśurāma, the axe-wielding Rāma, who according to myth unburdened the earth of the arrogant members of the warrior class twenty-one times.

There is nevertheless a hierarchy [among them], in the case of Viṣṇu, for instance, as [stated] in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (B.P., 1.3.28):

15a. And these are portions and sub-portions of the divine person,<sup>37</sup> but Kṛṣṇa is the Lord himself.

अष्टमस्तु तयोरासीत् स्वयमेव हरिः किल ॥ इति च ॥  
(ख) ॥ (भा. पु., १.२४.५५)

15b. Their<sup>38</sup> eighth child, however, was indeed Hari himself. (Bhāg. P., 9.24.55)

अथ श्रियस्तद् यथा पुरुषबोधिण्यामथर्वोपनिषदि:

गोकुलाख्ये माथुरमण्डल इत्युपक्रम्य द्वे पार्श्वे चन्द्रावली रा-  
धिका चेत्यभिधाय परत्र यस्या अंशे लक्ष्मीदुर्गादिका  
शक्तिरिति ॥ (ग) ॥

Now that [hierarchy] of Śrī, as in the *Puruṣabodhinī* section of the *Atharva Upaniṣad*:

15c. After beginning with “In the [place] called Gokula, in the region of Mathurā” and declaring “on the two sides, Candrāvalī and Rādhikā,” [it says] “in whose portions are the powers such as Lakṣmī, Durgā, and so forth.”<sup>39</sup>

<sup>37</sup>“Divine person” here is the primordial being referred to as *puruṣa*. As in the well known Vedic hymn the *Puruṣa-sūkta*, there are two *puruṣa*: an original one who begins the process of universal manifestation, and his offspring who enters into each universe and lies in its waters before creation. The divine person referred to here is the second *puruṣa* also known as Garbhodaśāyin, he who lies in the waters of the womb, a famous form of Viṣṇu. All of the descents described in the third chapter of the first canto of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* prior to the verse cited here are said to be this second *puruṣa*’s parts and parts of parts. Kṛṣṇa, however, is said to be the Lord (*bhagavān*) himself who started the whole process by assuming the form of the first *puruṣa*. This reverses the usual hierarchical order whereby Kṛṣṇa is seen as a partial manifestation of Viṣṇu.

<sup>38</sup>This refers to Devakī and Vasudeva, the human parents of Kṛṣṇa according to the account in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*.

<sup>39</sup>This passage claims that the goddesses Lakṣmī, Durgā, and so forth are portions or partial manifestations of Rādhikā. Candrāvalī is Rādhikā’s chief rival for Kṛṣṇa’s affection in the Kṛṣṇaite literature, but may have originally been merely another name for her.

गौतमीयतन्त्रे च :

देवी कृष्णमयी प्रोक्ता राधिका परदेवता ।  
सर्वलक्ष्मीमयी सर्वकान्तिः सम्मोहिनी परा ॥ (घ) ॥

And in the *Gautamīya Tantra*:

15d. Rādhikā is proclaimed the highest goddess, not different from Kṛṣṇa, having [him as her] deity, consisting of all the goddesses of fortune, possessed of all beauty, completely enchanting.

अथ नित्यधामत्वमादिशब्दात्, यथा छान्दोग्ये (छा. उ., ७.२४.१):

स भगवः कस्मिन् प्रतिष्ठित इति ।  
स्वे महिम्नीति ॥ (ङ) ॥

Now [his] eternal abode from the “and so forth,”<sup>40</sup> as in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (7.24.1):

15e. Revered sir, in what is that one established? In his own glory!<sup>41</sup>

दिव्ये ब्रह्मपुरे ह्येष संव्योमन्यात्मा प्रतिष्ठित इति च ॥ (मु.  
उ., २.२.७) ॥ (च) ॥

15f. This Self is situated in the divine city of Brahman in the sky.

ऋक्षु च (ऋग् वेद, १.१५४.६):

<sup>40</sup>The “and so forth” *ādi* occurs in verse 6 which all of the stanzas and citations up to the present one have been expanding upon.

<sup>41</sup>This section of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* is in the form of a conversation between Nārada and Sanatkumāra, with Nārada asking questions and Sanatkumāra giving answers. Interestingly, the final part of Sanatkumāra’s answer, “or perhaps not in glory,” is not noticed by the author.



ता वां वास्तून्युश्मसि गमध्यै  
 यत्र गावो भूरिशृङ्गा अयासः ।  
 अत्राह तदुरुगायस्य वृष्णः  
 परमं पदमवभाति भूरि ॥ (छ) ॥

And in the *R̥g Veda* (1.154.6):

15g. We desire to go to those dwellings of you two [Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa], where the cows are big horned and nimble. Here, they say, the highest abode of Urugāya,<sup>42</sup> the rainer of desires, shines brightly.

श्रीगोपालोपनिषदि च (गो. ता. उ., उत्तर ३५):

तासां मध्ये साक्षाद्ब्रह्मगोपालपुरी हि ॥ (ज) ॥

And in the *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* (2.35):

15h. In the midst of them is the town of Gopāla<sup>43</sup> which is Brahman itself.

जितन्ते स्तोत्रे च:

लोकं वैकुण्ठनामानं दिव्यषाड्गुण्यसंयुतम् ।  
 अवैष्णवानामप्राप्यं गुणत्रयविवर्जितम् ॥  
 नित्यसिद्धैः समाकीर्णं तन्मयैः पाञ्चकालिकैः ।  
 सभाप्रासादसंयुक्तं वनैश्चोपवनैः शुभम् ॥  
 वापीकूपतडागैश्च वृक्षषण्डैः सुमण्डितम् ।  
 अप्राकृतं सुरैर्वन्द्यमयुतार्कसमप्रभम् ॥ इति ॥ (झ) ॥

And in the *Jitante Stotra*<sup>44</sup>:

<sup>42</sup>Urugāya is an ancient name of Viṣṇu. It means “he who is praised by the great.”

<sup>43</sup>The commentators say the town meant here is Mathurā.

<sup>44</sup>This hymn (*stotra*) is from the *Nārada-pañcarātra*. It is called the “Jitante” *stotra* because it begins with the Sanskrit words *jitaṃ te*, “conquered by you.” It occurs in a conversation between Nārada and Brahmā.

15i. The world named *Vaikuṇṭha*, is endowed with the six divine qualities,<sup>45</sup> unattainable by those who are not *Vaiṣṇava*, free of the three *guṇa*, filled with eternally perfected beings who are absorbed in him [*Viṣṇu*] and intent on the five timely practices,<sup>46</sup> possessed of assembly halls and palaces, beautified by forests and groves, adorned with ponds, wells, tanks, as well as arbors, an immaterial [abode], praised by the gods, and as radiant as ten thousand suns.<sup>47</sup>

ब्रह्मसंहितायां च (ब्र. सं., ५.२):

सहस्रपत्रं कमलं गोकुलाख्यं महत्पदं ।  
तत्कर्णिकारं तद्धाम तदनन्तांशसम्भवम् ॥ इति ॥ (ज) ॥

And in the *Brahma-saṁhitā* (5.2):

15j. A thousand petalled lotus, called *Gokula*, is the abode of the great [*Kṛṣṇa*] and its pericarp is his land, born of a portion of *Ananta*.<sup>48</sup>

प्रपञ्चे स्वात्मकं लोकमवतार्य महेश्वरः ।  
आविर्भवति तत्रेति मतं ब्रह्मादिशब्दतः ॥ १६ ॥  
गोविन्दे सच्चिदानन्दे नरदारकता यथा ।  
अज्ञैर्निरूप्यते तद्वद्वाम्नि प्राकृतता किल ॥ १७ ॥

<sup>45</sup>The six divine qualities are the same as the six kingly measures of diplomacy: alliance (*sandhi*), war (*vigraha*), marching (*yāna*), halting (*āsana*), duplicity (*dvaiddhī*), and shelter (*āśraya*).

<sup>46</sup>The five timely practices are: approaching (the temple of the deity), preparation (of the implements of worship), worship, study (i.e., repetition of sacred formulae, mantra), and meditation.

<sup>47</sup>The *stotra* is completed with:

when will I see you with my own eyes, Keśava, possessor of the finest power of goodness (*sattva*), sporting with *Ramā* (Śrī) in the leisure grounds.

<sup>48</sup>Akṣaya Kumāmara Śāstrī, citing Jīva Gosvāmin's commentary on this verse of the *Brahma-saṁhitā*, says that *Ananta* is a portion of *Baladeva*, the elder brother of *Kṛṣṇa*, who is believed to be himself an expansion or transformation of *Kṛṣṇa*. *Baladeva* functions to support *Kṛṣṇa*'s sport by manifesting the conditions for its possibility such as its location and paraphernalia.

16. The great lord causes the world which is his own to descend into the manifest world and himself appears in it. This is the understanding that comes from the words *brahman* and so forth.<sup>49</sup>

17. Just as ordinary human boyhood is ascribed by ignorant people to Govinda, who is really eternal being, consciousness, and bliss, materialness is also [wrongly] ascribed to his abode.

अथ नित्यलीलत्वं च , तथाहि श्रुतिः (बृह्. आ. उ. , ३.८.३):

यद्गतं भवच्च भविष्यच्च ॥ (क) ॥

And now his having eternal sport, as in the revealed texts (Bṛhad.-ā. U., 3.8.3):

17a. That which was, is, and will be.<sup>50</sup>

एको देवो नित्यलीलानुरक्तो  
भक्तव्यापी भक्तहृद्यन्तरात्मा ॥ (ख) ॥

17b. The one god, engaged in eternal sport, pervading the devotee, the inner self in the heart of the devotee.<sup>51</sup>

स्मृतिश्च (भ. गी. , ४.९):

जन्म कर्म च मे दिव्यमेवं यो वेत्ति तत्त्वतः ।  
त्यक्त्वा देहं पुनर्जन्म नैति मामेति सोऽर्जुन ॥ (ग) ॥

<sup>49</sup>That is, the words *brahman*, *mahiman*, and *savyoman* that were used in the previously cited passages from the *Upaniṣads*. They all indicate that his abodes are not of this world.

<sup>50</sup>This is a small portion of a question posed by Vācakanvī Gārgī to Yājñavalkya. Her question is: on what are all things, past, present, and future woven back and forth? His first answer is “space” *ākāśa*. In answer to her next question, on what space is woven, he answers the “imperishable” *akṣara*. Its use here seems to be to introduce the idea of the eternity of Brahman which in this tradition means the eternity of Kṛṣṇa.

<sup>51</sup>Kṛṣṇadeva says that this verse comes from the Pippalāda branch of the Atharva Veda. No *Upaniṣads* have survived from that branch. Pippalāda is the sage featured in the *Praśna Upaniṣad*.

And in tradition (Bhag. Gī., 4.9):

17c. My birth and activity are divine and one who knows it thusly does not again come to birth after leaving his body. Instead, he comes to me, O Arjuna!

रूपानन्त्याज्जनानन्त्याद्धामानन्त्याच्च कर्म तत् ।  
नित्यं स्यात्तदभेदाच्चेत्युदितं तत्त्ववित्तमैः ॥ १८ ॥

18. Because of unlimited forms, unlimited companions, unlimited abodes, and its non-difference from him, his activity should be [considered] eternal. This is stated by those who are the best knowers of truth.

Thus ends the first chapter of the Necklace of Truths  
entitled:  
the Supremacy of the Lord

## Chapter 2

### Second Truth: Hari is known by all the Veda

अथाखिलाम्नायवेद्यत्वं

यथा श्रीगोपालोपनिषदि (गो.ता.उ., उत्तर २७):

योऽसौ सर्वैर्वेदैर्गीयते ॥ इति ॥ (क) ॥

Now his being known by all the sacred texts, as in the *Gopāla-taapanī Upaniṣad* (1.27):

A. He is the one who is sung by all the Vedas.

काठके च (क. उ., १.२.१५):

सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति  
तपांसि सर्वाणि च यद्वदन्ति ॥ इति ॥ (ख) ॥

And in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* (1.2.15):

B. That being which all the Veda proclaim, of which all austerities speak.<sup>1</sup>

श्रीहरिवंशे च:

---

<sup>1</sup>The rest of the verse is:

वेदे रामायणे चैव पुराणे भारते तथा ।  
 आदावन्ते च मध्ये च हरिः सर्वत्र गीयते ॥ इति ॥ (ग)  
 ॥

And in the *Harivaṃśa*:

c. In the Veda, *Rāmāyaṇa*, and *Purāṇa*, as well as in the *Mahābhārata*, in the beginning, at the end, and in the middle, Hari is everywhere praised.

साक्षात्परम्पराभ्यां वेदा गायन्ति माधवं सर्वे ।  
 वेदान्ताः किल साक्षादपरे तेभ्यः परम्परया ॥ १ ॥

1. All the Veda praise Mādhava either directly or indirectly; the Vedānta parts, indeed, directly and the portions other than them indirectly.<sup>2</sup>

क्वचित् क्वचिदवाच्यत्वं यद्वेदेषु विलोक्यते ।  
 कात्स्न्येन वाच्यं न भवेदिति स्यात्तत्र सद्गतिः ।  
 अन्यथा तु तदारम्भो व्यर्थः स्यादिति मे मतिः ॥ २ ॥

2. Though considered here and there in the Veda to be indescribable, he cannot be described in his entirety. Such is the true intent there [in such passages]. Otherwise I think even beginning a description would be pointless.<sup>3</sup>

---

... desiring which they perform *brahmacarya* [a set of religious practices associated with being a celibate student], that word I will speak about to you in brief, it is 'om.'

Here the word *pada*, which can mean many things including foot, word, goal, and position, seems to mean the sacred word or syllable "om." Our author and his commentators interpret it to mean the true nature *svarūpa* or position of the absolute, i.e. of Kṛṣṇa.

<sup>2</sup>Since the Veda contain many passages that establish the performance of rites, how can they be said to present Kṛṣṇa? To this objection our author says that those passages about rites, the so-called *karma-kāṇḍa* portions of the Veda, point to Kṛṣṇa indirectly. They bring about a purification of the heart which is part of the process of coming to know Kṛṣṇa. The members of the Advaita tradition recognize a similar role for the ritual portions of the Vedic texts.

<sup>3</sup>Kṛṣṇadeva gives the mythological Mount Meru as an example. Mount Meru is the cosmic mountain that runs through the center of the cosmos according to ancient Hindu cosmological belief. Though it is seen, because it is not or cannot be seen in its entirety it

शब्दप्रवृत्तिहेतूनां जात्यादीनामभावतः ।  
 ब्रह्म निर्धर्मकं वाच्यं नैवेत्याहुर्विपश्चितः ॥ ३ ॥  
 सर्वैः शब्दैरवाच्ये तु लक्षणा न भवेदतः ।  
 लक्ष्यञ्च न भवेद् धर्महीनं ब्रह्मेति मे मतम् ॥ ४ ॥

3. The learned say that because of an absence of class qualifiers and so forth,<sup>4</sup> which are the causes of the use of words, quality-less Brahman is not describable.

4. But if it were indescribable by *all* words then indirect signification would not be possible. And therefore, a Brahman devoid of qualities could not be indirectly signified either. This is my view.<sup>5</sup>

Thus ends the Second Truth in the Necklace of Truths  
 entitled:  
 "Hari is known by all the Veda"

is sometimes said to be unseen. Such is the case with Hari (Viṣṇu) in those passages that proclaim his indescribability. If it were not so, according to the commentator, beginning the study of the Veda in order to know him would be useless.

<sup>4</sup>Class qualifiers (*jāti*) are qualities that govern inclusion in a particular class or species. Horseness, for instance, is the set of qualities that determines whether an individual belongs in the class of horses. Thus, if one wants to use the word "horse" to describe an individual it must have those characteristics. The strict philosophical definition of *jāti* is "while being eternal it inheres in many (individuals)" (नित्यत्वे सति अनेकसमवेतत्वम्). These are also known as universals (*sāmānya*). Apart from classes, qualities (*guṇa*), actions (*kriyā*), and names (*saṃjñā*) are the causes for the use of words.

<sup>5</sup>This is an argument aimed directly at paragraphs 116-122 of the *Vedānta-sāra* where the problem of the how the great pronouncements of the *Upaniṣads* can convey Brahman are discussed. Sadānanda argues for partial indirect signification (*bhāga-lakṣaṇā*). Baladeva points out that if any kind of signification takes place, Brahman cannot be indescribable. Kṛṣṇadeva in his commentary points out that in the example used by the Advaitin, "that is this Devadatta," wherein the "that" and the "this" meanings, which are contradictory, are dropped leaving only the "substance" Devadatta behind, Devadatta, the underlying substance, is still describable by words.





## Chapter 3

### Third Truth: The Universe is Real

स्वशक्त्या सृष्टवान् विष्णुर्यथार्थं सर्वविज्जगत् ।  
इत्युक्तेः सत्यमेवैतद्वैराग्यार्थमसद्वचः ॥ १ ॥

1. “Viṣṇu, the all-knowing, created the real world with his own power.”  
From this statement [one learns that] this world is indeed real. Statements  
of its unreality are for the purpose of [creating] detachment.

तथाहि श्वेताश्वतरोपनिषदि (‘स्वे. उ., ४.१)

य एकोऽवर्णो बहुधा शक्तियोगाद्  
वर्णाननेकान्निहितार्थो दधाति ॥ इति ॥ (क) ॥

As in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (4.1):

1a. Although one and without class [or color, or letter], with some purpose in mind, he created many classes [or colors, or letters] through the manifold application of his power.

श्रीविष्णुपुराणे च (वि.पु., १.२२.५४):

एकदेशस्थितस्याग्नेज्योत्स्ना विस्तारिणी यथा ।  
परस्य ब्रह्मणः शक्तिस्तथेदमखिलं जगत् ॥ इति ॥ (ख) ॥

And in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (1.22.54):

1b. Just as the light of a fire, situated in one place, spreads out [far and wide], this whole universe is an expansion of the power of supreme Brahman.<sup>1</sup>

ईशावास्योपनिषदि (ई. उ. , ८):

स पर्यगाच्छुक्रमकायमव्रणम्  
अस्त्राविरं शुद्धमपापविद्धम् ।  
कविर्मनीषी परिभूः स्वयंभूर्  
याथातथ्यतोऽर्थान् व्यदधाच्छाश्वतीभ्यः समाभ्यः ॥ इति ॥  
(ग) ॥

In the *Īśāvāsya Upaniṣad* (8):

1c. He who is all-pervading, effulgent, bodiless, woundless, veinless, pure, unpierced by sin, the seer, intelligent, all-conquering, self-born, created things as real for everlasting ages.<sup>2</sup>

श्रीविष्णुपुराणे च (वि. पु. , १.२२.५८):

तदेतदक्षयं नित्यं जगन्मुनिवराखिलम् ।  
आविर्भावतिरोभावजन्मनाशविकल्पवत् ॥ इति ॥ (घ) ॥

And in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (1.22.58):

1d. O Best of Sages, this whole world is undiminishing and unchanging, possessing the illusory alternatives of appearance and disappearance, birth and destruction.<sup>3</sup>

महाभारते च (म. भा. , अश्वमेध ३५.३४):

<sup>1</sup>This universe is the effect of the power of Hari who is in the highest sky. This visible universe is extremely far from that. So writes the commentator Kṛṣṇadeva.

<sup>2</sup>The two attributes, bodiless and veinless, mean, according to Kṛṣṇadeva, that Viṣṇu has no subtle or gross body. For the components of those bodies see paras 57-92 in the *Vedānta-sāra* translation.

<sup>3</sup>The commentators suggest that the words “undiminishing” and “unchanging” apply to different aspects of the world. “Undiminishing” applies to nature (*prakṛti*) and the

ब्रह्म सत्यं तपः सत्यं सत्यं चैव प्रजापतिः ।  
 सत्याद्भूतानि जातानि सत्यं भूतमयं जगत् ॥ इति ॥ (ङ)  
 ॥

And in the *Mahābhārata* (*Aśvamedha*, 35.34):

1e. Brahman is real, austerity is real, and real, too, is the progenitor (Brahmā). The beings are born from the real and the universe made of the elements is real.<sup>4</sup>

आत्मा वा इदमित्यादौ वनलीनविहङ्गवत् ।  
 सत्त्वं विश्वस्य मन्तव्यमित्युक्तं वेदवेदिभिः ॥ २ ॥

2. In statements such as “only this self alone existed in the beginning ...,” the existence of the universe is like that of a bird blending in to the forest. This is stated by knowers of the Veda.<sup>5</sup>

Thus ends the Third Truth in the Necklace of Truths  
 entitled:  
 “The Universe is Real”

living being (*jīva*) since they undergo transformation (*pariṇāma*), but not diminution. The “unchanging” applies to the lord who is immovable and unchanging. Appearance and disappearance are alternatives that apply to the lord; and birth and destruction apply to nature and the living being and are not to be understood as real birth and destruction, but as changes of state or transformation. Akṣaya Kumāra points out that for the living being, too, this is only an apparent transformation.

<sup>4</sup>The commentators suggest that this verse traces in brief the manifestation of the universe as the Vaiṣṇavas conceive it. Brahman refers to the eternal, conscious, and joyful Brahman whose mere intention comes true *satya-saṅkalpa*. Austerity refers to the reflection done by Viṣṇu as he enters the universe/womb. The progenitor is Brahmā who is born from a lotus from Viṣṇu’s navel. The beings are born from Brahmā as is the universe made of elements. Thus everything has its source in the real and therefore is real.

<sup>5</sup>Some statements of the *Upaniṣads*, such as the one cited in this verse from the *Aitareya Upaniṣad*, give the impression that in the beginning only the Self existed. Thus, the manifest universe, being non-existent at that time, is not real and therefore not eternal. Such passages are strongly supportive of the position of Advaita Vedānta. Baladeva counters such claims by saying that the manifest universe does indeed exist at that time, but it is merged with the Self like birds sometimes are merged with a forest, that is, rest in the trees of the forest, leaving only the forest visible.



## Chapter 4

### Fourth Truth: Difference is Real

अथ विष्णुतो जीवानां भेदः ।

तथाहि श्वेताश्वतराः पठन्ति (श्वे. उ., ४.६):

द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया  
समानं वृक्षं परिषस्वजाते ।  
तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्व-  
त्त्यनश्नन्नन्योऽभिचाकशीति ॥ (क) ॥

Now the difference of the living beings from Viṣṇu.

For instance the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* reads (4.6):

A. Two birds, friends, jointly inhabit the same tree [the body]. One of them eats the sweet fig; the other, not eating, simply shines.<sup>1</sup>

समाने वृक्षे पुरुषो निमग्नो  
ऽनीशया शोचति मुह्यमानः ।

---

<sup>1</sup>One of the birds is the living being who enjoys or suffers the fruit of its past action (*karman*) and the other is the lord who merely looks on or regulates the living being. The lord and the living being are thus represented as distinct in this passage.

जुष्टं यदा पश्यत्यन्यमीशम्  
अस्य महिमानमिति वीतशोकः ॥ (ख) ॥ (मु. उ.,  
३.१.२)

[and in the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (3.1.2)]

B. A person engrossed in the same tree, befuddled by his impotence, laments. When he sees the other, the lord, who is endowed [with auspicious traits], and his greatness, he becomes free of sorrow.<sup>2</sup>

उपक्रमोपसंहारावभ्यासोऽपूर्वता फलम् ।  
अर्थवादोपपत्तौ च लिङ्गं तात्पर्यनिर्णये ॥  
इति तात्पर्यलिङ्गानि षड्रान्याहुर्मनीषिणः ।  
भेदे तानि प्रतीयन्ते तेनासौ तस्य गोचरः ॥ १ ॥

1. “Opening and closing statements, repetition, novelty, result, glorification, and justification; these are the marks in determining intention.” The thoughtful say that those six marks of intended meaning<sup>3</sup> are perceived [to point] to difference. Therefore, it [difference] is the horizon of scripture’s intention.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup>This verse and the one before it appear in both the *Śvetāśvatara* (4.6-7) and *Muṇḍaka* (3.1.1-2) *Upaniṣads*. Some readings have the word *eti* in place of *iti* which changes the meaning to:

When he sees the other, the lord, who is endowed [with auspicious traits],  
he becomes free of sorrow and goes to his [the lord’s] greatness.”

According to Kṛṣṇadeva “greatness” means his abode; according to Akṣaya Kumāra Śāstrī it means a likeness in characteristics with the lord].

<sup>3</sup>There are six marks because opening and closing are considered to go together and are therefore one.

<sup>4</sup>The first verse we already have seen cited in the *Sāra* at para. 129 and explained in para. 130. Both texts recognize the *Bṛhat-saṃhitā* as its source. Interestingly, although the “marks” are therefore the same the authors reach opposite conclusions with them. Sadānanda applies the marks to the important passage of the *Chandogya Upaniṣad* that contains the great pronouncement “that you are” and concludes that non-difference between Brahman and the self is the intention. Here Baladeva applies it to the two verses from the *Śvetāśvatara* and *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣads* and concludes that they teach difference between Brahman and self. Both are correct. The question is which of these passages carries more force. For the Advaitin the *Chandogya* passage does while for the Vaiṣṇava Vedāntins the *Śvetāśvatara/Muṇḍaka* passage does.

किंच मुण्डके (मु. उ., ३.१.३):

यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णं  
कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोनिम् ।  
तदा विद्वान् पुण्यपापे विधूय  
निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति ॥ (क) ॥

Moreover, in the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* (3.1.3):

1a. When a seer sees the radiant agent, the lord, the supreme person who is source of the Veda, [that] knower rids himself of merit and demerit and, free of impurity, reaches the highest similarity.<sup>5</sup>

काठके च (क. उ., ४.१.१४):

यथोदकं शुद्धे शुद्धमासिक्तं तादृगेव भवति ।  
एवं मुनेर्विजानत आत्मा भवति गौतम ॥ (ख) ॥

And in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* (4.1.14):

1b. As pure water poured into pure water becomes like it, so does the self of a knowing sage, O Gautama.<sup>6</sup>

श्रीगीतासु च (भ. गी., १४.२):

इदं ज्ञानमुपाश्रित्य मम साधर्म्यमागताः ।  
सर्गेऽपि नोपजायन्ते प्रलये न व्यथन्ति च ॥ (ग) ॥

<sup>5</sup>This citation, according to Kṛṣṇadeva, answers the objection that the six marks of intention are also used to support non-difference. In this passage the ultimate goal is not recognized as non-difference, but as similarity *sāmya*. Similarity is taken to be a likeness or sameness of qualities, not non-difference.

<sup>6</sup>As the water becomes *like* other water, but not that other water, so the self becomes *like* the lord, but not the lord. This is the teaching Baladeva finds in this verse.

And in the *Bhagavad-gītā* (14.2):

1c. Having reached this knowledge, they attain similarity with me. They are not born in the creation nor do they suffer in the destruction.<sup>7</sup>

एषु मोक्षेऽपि भेदोक्तेः स्याद्भेदः पारमार्थिकः ।  
 ब्रह्माहमेको जीवोऽस्मि नान्ये जीवा न चेश्वरः ॥ २ ॥  
 मदविद्याकल्पितास्ते स्युरितीत्यं च दूषितम् ।  
 अन्यथा नित्य इत्यादिश्रुत्यर्थो नोपपद्यते ॥ ३ ॥

2-3. Because of the mention of difference even in liberation in these statements, difference is ultimately true. 'I am Brahman,' 'I am the one living being,' 'there are no other living beings nor a god,' 'those are concocted from my own ignorance,' [these beliefs] are thus falsified. Otherwise the meaning of the revealed passage beginning "the eternal being ..." [*nityo nityānām*] cannot be explained.

तथाहि कठाः पठन्ति (क. उ., २.२.१३):

नित्यो नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनानाम्  
 एको बहूनां यो विदधाति कामान् ।  
 तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीरास्  
 तेषां शान्तिः शाश्वती नेतरेषाम् ॥ (क) ॥

As the author of the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* says (2.2.13):

3a. The eternal being among eternal beings, the sentient being among sentient beings, the one being among the many beings grants their desires. Those steadfast ones, who perceive him in the self, have everlasting peace, not others.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup>Akṣaya Kumāra Śāstrī points out that in the conception of liberation presented in this verse, the liberated are referred to in the plural. This does not support idea of a loss of distinguishing characteristics that is envisioned in non-dualistic liberation.

<sup>8</sup>This is the *Upaniṣadic* passage that was referred to in the previous verse. If the reading "the eternal among the eternal" *nityo nityānām* is accepted then this statement does support ultimate difference. An alternate reading is found which would be translated "the eternal among the non-eternals" *nityo 'nityānām* which would not support ultimate difference, however.



एकस्मादीश्वरान्नित्याच्चेतनात्तादृशा मिथः ।  
 भिद्यन्ते बहवो जीवास्तेन भेदः सनातनः ॥ ४ ॥  
 प्राणैकाधीनवृत्तित्वाद् वागादेः प्राणता यथा ।  
 तथा ब्रह्माधीनवृत्तेर्जगतो ब्रह्मतोच्यते ॥ ५ ॥

4. Mutually distinct from the one lord who is eternal and conscious, are the many living beings who are similar to him. Thus, difference is eternal.

5. As the speech and other [bodily functions] are said to be the life breath because they are functions completely under the control of the life breath, so the universe is said to be Brahman because it exists under the control of Brahman.<sup>9</sup>

तथाहि छान्दोग्ये पद्यते (छा. उ., ५.१.१५):

न वै वाचो न चक्षूषि न श्रोत्राणि न मनांसीत्याचक्षते  
 प्राण इत्येवाचक्षते प्राणो ह्येवैतानि सर्वाणि भवति ॥ (क)  
 ॥

And so it is said in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (5.1.15):

5a. They do not indeed call them speech nor eyes nor ears nor minds. Life breaths alone do they call them because life breath indeed becomes all these.

ब्रह्मव्याप्यत्वतः कैश्चिज्जगद् ब्रह्मेति मन्यते ॥ ६ ॥

6. Because it is pervaded by Brahman, some consider the world to be Brahman.<sup>10</sup>

यदुक्तं श्रीविष्णुपुराणे (वि. पु., १.९.६९):

<sup>9</sup>This proposition responds to an objection put forward by the Advaita opposition to the effect that if difference is eternal then what can be made of statements in the *Upaniṣads* like “All this is Brahman” (Chānd. U., 3.14.1) and “That you are” (Chānd. U., 6.8.7). The *Upaniṣadic* support for the idea of calling the senses life breath because they are dependent on the life breath is given in the next verse.

<sup>10</sup>This is another possible interpretation of statements like “all this indeed is Brahman.”

योऽयं तवागतो देव समीपं देवतागणः ।  
सत्यमेव जगत्स्रष्टा यतः सर्वगतो भवान् ॥ (क) ॥

As stated in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (1.9.69):

6a. O lord, it is true that this group of gods has come to you since you are the all-pervading creator of the world.

प्रतिबिम्बपरिच्छेदपक्षौ यौ स्वीकृतौ परैः ।  
विभुत्वाविषयत्वाभ्यां तौ विद्वद्भिर्निराकृतौ ॥ ७ ॥

7. The two positions of reflection and delimitation that are accepted by others are refuted by the learned because it [Brahman] is all-pervading and not an object.<sup>11</sup>

अद्वैतं ब्रह्मणो भिन्नमभिन्नं वा त्वयोच्यते ।  
आद्ये द्वैतापत्तेरन्ते सिद्धसाधनताश्रुतेः ॥ ८ ॥

8. Is the non-duality you describe different from Brahman or not different? In the first case, there is the unwanted result of duality and, in the second, the revealed texts [would be guilty of] establishing what is already established.<sup>12</sup>

अलीकं निर्गुणं ब्रह्म प्रमाणाविषयत्वतः ।  
अद्वैतं विदुषां नैवेत्युचिरे तत्त्ववादिनः ॥ ९ ॥

<sup>11</sup>The “others” referred to here are of course the two schools of Advaita Vedānta, the Vivaraṇa school and the Bhāmati school, whose views are maintained in tandem in the *Vedānta-sāra* through the examples of sky reflected in a lake or sky (space) delimited by forest. Two criticisms are raised in this verse of those two Advaitin positions. The first is that since Brahman is all-pervading and therefore formless, the reflection position cannot be accepted because something without a form cannot be reflected. Secondly, Brahman or consciousness is not an object and thus is not subject to delimitation. It is not like a rock that can be broken into pieces by a hatchet. Thus according to Baladeva Brahman as conceived by the Advaitins can neither be reflected or delimited.

<sup>12</sup>Here the question concerns the status of non-duality itself. Is it the same or different from Brahman? In either case Baladeva sees a problem. This may be no more than a quality of Advaitic discourse that Baladeva wants to portray as a flaw, a problem arising from the different ways in which the two traditions look at and use language.

9. Brahman without qualities is false because it is not the object of any means of knowledge.<sup>13</sup> It is not an object of faith for the wise. So say those who know the truth [or followers of Madhva].

Thus ends the Fourth Truth  
entitled:  
"Difference is Real"

---

<sup>13</sup>According to the commentator Kṛṣṇadeva, quality-less Brahman cannot be known by means of perception because it has no form, by means of inference because it has no characteristic that it pervades, nor by means of testimony because it has no characteristic that can be verbalized. It is therefore false like the horns of a hare.



## Chapter 5

### Fifth Truth: The Living Beings are Servants of Hari

अथ जीवानां भगवद्दासत्वम् ।

तथाहि श्वेताश्वतराः पठन्ति (श्वे. उ., ६.७):

तमीश्वराणां परमं महेश्वरं  
तं देवतानां परमं च दैवतम् ।  
पतिं पतीनां परमं परस्ताद्  
विदाम देवं भुवनेशमीड्यम् ॥ (क) ॥

Now the living beings' servitude towards the lord.

Thus says the author of the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (6.7):

A. May we know him who is the highest lord among lords, the highest god among gods, the highest master beyond the masters, the deity, the worshipable lord of the world.<sup>1</sup>

स्मृतिश्च

---

<sup>1</sup>According to the commentators the lords are divine beings like Brahmā, the creator god, and Rudra, the destroyer god. The gods are Indra and the others of the Vedic pantheon. The masters are the early progenitors of mankind like Dakṣa and so forth. Though this verse does not explicitly say that the living beings are servants of Viṣṇu, recognizing

ब्रह्मा शम्भुस्तथैवार्कश्चन्द्रमाश्च शतक्रतुः ।  
 एवमाद्यास्तथैवान्ये युक्ता वैष्णवतेजसा ॥ इत्याद्या ॥  
 सब्रह्मकाः सरुद्राश्च सेन्द्रा देवा महर्षिभिः ।  
 अर्चयन्ति सुरश्रेष्ठं देवं नारायणं हरिम् ॥ इति च (ख) ॥

And in tradition:

B. Brahmā, Śiva, the Sun and Moon gods, and Indra, thus the foremost as well as the others are possessed of the power of Viṣṇu.

and so forth, and

The gods including Brahmā, Rudra, Indra, along with the great sages worship the best of deities, the god Nārāyaṇa, Hari.<sup>2</sup>

पाद्रे च जीवलक्षणे :

दासभूतो हरेरेव नान्यस्यैव कदाचन ॥ (ग) ॥

And in the definition of the living being in the *Padma Purāṇa*:

C. The servant of Hari alone, not ever of any other.

Thus ends the Fifth Truth  
 entitled:  
 "The Living Beings are Servants of Hari"

---

him as the highest of lords, gods, and masters implies that they have a relationship of servitude with respect to him. All of these lords, gods, and masters are believed to be in reality ordinary living beings who have important roles in the running of the universe. If they are servants of Viṣṇu, so are all other living beings.

<sup>2</sup>The point here is the same as in the previous verse. The traditional sources of these verses is unknown.

## Chapter 6

### Sixth Truth: A Hierarchy Exists among Living Beings

अथ जीवानां तारतम्यम्:

अणुचैतन्यरूपत्वज्ञानित्वाद्यविशेषतः ।

साम्ये सत्यपि जीवानां तारतम्यञ्च साधनात् ॥ १ ॥

Now the hierarchy of living beings.

1. Even though they are equal because they are indistinct in matters like being of the nature of minute consciousness and being possessed of knowledge, there is a hierarchy among living beings due to their accomplishments.

तत्राणुत्वमुक्तं श्वेताश्वतरैः (श्वे. उ., ५.९):

बालाग्रशतभागस्य शतधा कल्पितस्य च ।

भागो जीवः स विज्ञेयः स चानन्त्याय कल्पते ॥ (क) ॥

On that topic, minuteness is stated by the author of the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (5.9):

1a. The living being is known as a hundredth part of a hundredth part of the tip of a hair and it is capable of becoming endless [liberation].

चैतन्यरूपत्वं ज्ञानित्वादिकञ्च षट्प्रश्न्यां (प्र. उ., ४.९):

एष हि द्रष्टा स्प्रष्टा श्रोता घ्राता रसयिता मन्ता  
बोद्धा कर्ता विज्ञानात्मा पुरुषः ॥ (ख) ॥

Its being formed of consciousness and being a knower and the rest are as in the *Praśna Upaniṣad* (4.9):

1b. This person consisting of consciousness, indeed, is the seer, the toucher, the hearer, the smeller, the thinker, the knower, the doer.<sup>1</sup>

आदिना गुणेन देहव्यापित्वञ्च श्रीगीतासु (भ. गी., १३.३३):

यथा प्रकाशयत्येकः कृत्स्नं लोकं इमं रविः ।  
क्षेत्रं क्षेत्री तथा कृत्स्नं प्रकाशयति भारत ॥ (ग) ॥

And by “and so forth” is meant its pervading the body with its quality as [stated] in the *Bhagavad-gītā* (13.33):

1c. As one sun lights up this entire world, so does the possessor of the field [the living being] light up the entire field [the body], O descendant of Bharata.

आह चैव सूत्रकारः (ब्र. सू., २.३.२४):

गुणाद्बालोकवत् ॥ (घ) ॥

And the writer of the *Brahma-sūtra* says this:

1d. Or, from its quality, like a lamp.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Commentator Akṣaya Kumāra Śāstrī remarks that the self’s being identified as both made of consciousness and conscious in this verse refutes the logician’s claim that the self has knowledge, but is not itself knowledge and the Advaitin’s claim that the self is knowledge, but is not a knower.

<sup>2</sup>The author of the *Kāntimālā* commentary, Kṛṣṇadeva. gives as the full meaning of this *sūtra*:

As a lamp through its quality of light spreads through the entire house, so the living being through its quality of awareness spreads through the whole body.



गुणनित्यत्वमुक्तम् वाजसनेयिभिः (बृ. उ., ४.५.१४):

अविनाशी वा अरे अयमात्मानुच्छित्तिधर्मा ॥ (ङ) ॥

The eternity of its quality is stated by the author of the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (4.5.14):

1e. This self, indeed, possessing inseparable characteristics, is indestructible.

एवं साम्येऽपि वैषम्यमैहिकं कर्मभिः स्फुटम् ।  
प्राहुः पारत्रिकं तत्तु भक्तिभेदैः सुकोविदः ॥ २ ॥

2. Thus even though there is equality [among living beings], a this-worldly inequality is clearly manifested by their actions. But the wise proclaim there is that [inequality] in the next world, too, though different types of *bhakti*.<sup>3</sup>

तथाहि कौथुमाः पठन्ति:

यथाऋतुरस्मिँल्लोके पुरुषो भवति ।  
तथेतः प्रेत्य भवति ॥ इति ॥ (क) ॥

So indeed do the members of the Kauthuma branch<sup>4</sup> say:

2a. A person is in accordance with [his] sacrifice in this world, and so is he after passing from here.<sup>5</sup>

स्मृतिश्च:

<sup>3</sup>Although there is a fundamental equality among all living beings reflected in their characteristic qualities, inequality is created among them in two spheres. In this world inequality exists through their actions. This is effected by action or *karman*. In the next world, that is, after liberation, an inequality is created by their different types of *bhakti*.

<sup>4</sup>Kauthuma, a Vedic branch now apparently lost.

<sup>5</sup>The same point is made here as in the previous verse. In this world one's condition is dependent on one's ritual action or works. In the next world, that is after death, one's condition is dependent on one's action or, in this case, type of worship.

यादृशी भावना यस्य सिद्धिर्भवति तादृशी ॥ इति ॥ (ख)  
॥

And in tradition:

2b. As is one's meditation, so is one's achievement.

शान्त्याद्या रतिपर्यन्ता ये भावाः पञ्च कीर्तिताः ।  
तैर्देवं स्मरतां पुंसां तारतम्यं मिथो मतम् ॥ ३ ॥

3. Of those persons remembering the lord by those five feelings, from peacefulness to love, there is considered a hierarchy with respect to each other.<sup>6</sup>

Thus ends the Sixth Truth  
entitled:  
"A Hierarchy Exists among Living Beings"

---

<sup>6</sup>The principle of differentiation among living beings after death or rather after liberation is, according to this text, the various feelings or emotional types of *bhakti* to the deity. The emotions are five: peacefulness, a serving attitude, friendliness, parental love, and amorous love in ascending order of superiority. Those who have these emotions are thus also ordered in an ascending hierarchy as are the forms of the lord toward which they feel those emotions. That is what is meant by "mutual" hierarchy in this verse.

## Chapter 7

### Seventh Truth: Liberation is Attaining Kṛṣṇa

अथ श्रीकृष्णप्राप्तेर्मोक्षत्वम् ।

यथा :

ज्ञात्वा देवं सर्वपाशापहानिः ॥ इत्यादि (क) ॥ (श्वे. उ., १.१०)

एको वशी सर्वगः कृष्ण ईदृशम् ॥ इत्यादि च (ख) ॥ (गो. ता. उ., पूर्व, २०)

Now, liberation as the attainment of Kṛṣṇa.

As it is said in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (1.10) and the *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* (1.20) respectively:

A. After knowing the deity, all fetters are destroyed.

B. Kṛṣṇa, the one, the controller, present everywhere, is to be worshiped.

बहुधा बहुभिर्वेशैर्भाति कृष्णः स्वयं प्रभुः ।  
तमिदृशं तत्पदे नित्ये सुखं तिष्ठन्ति मोक्षिनः ॥ १ ॥

1. Kṛṣṇa, the lord himself, appears many times with many forms. Desiring him, the liberated happily abide in his eternal abode.

Thus ends the Seventh Truth  
entitled  
"Liberation is Attaining Kṛṣṇa"

## Chapter 8

### Eighth Truth: Pure Bhakti Bestows Liberation

अथैकान्तभक्तेर्मोक्षहेतुत्वम् ।

यथा श्रीगोपालतापन्याम्:

भक्तिरस्य भजनं तदिहामुत्रोपाधिनैरास्येनामुष्मिन्  
मनःकल्पनमेतदेव नैष्कर्म्यम् ॥ (क) ॥ (गो. ता. उ.,  
पूर्व १४)

Now, single-minded *bhakti* is the cause of liberation.

As [stated] in the *Gopāla-tāpanī Upaniṣad* (1.14):

A. *Bhakti* is the worship of this one [Kṛṣṇa] and that is fixing the mind on him along with rejecting all limiting conditions either in this life or in the next. This is true actionlessness.

नारदपञ्चरात्रे च:

सर्वोपाधिविनिर्मुक्तं तत्परत्वेन निर्मलम् ।  
हृषीकेण हृषीकेशसेवनं भक्तिरुच्यते ॥ (ख) ॥

And in the *Nāradapañcarātra*:

B. *Bhakti* is said to be the service of the lord of the senses [Kṛṣṇa] with the senses — service that is free of all conditions and pure by focusing on him.

नवधा चैषा भवति ।

यदुक्तं श्रीभागवते (भा. पु., ७.५.२३-२४):

श्रवनं कीर्तनं विष्णोः स्मरणं पादसेवनम् ।  
 अर्चनं वन्दनं दास्यं सख्यमात्मनिवेदनम् ॥  
 इति पुंसार्पिता विष्णौ भक्तिश्चेन्नवलक्षणा ।  
 क्रियते भगवत्यद्धा तन्मन्येऽधीतमुत्तमम् ॥ (ग) ॥

And this is ninefold.

As stated in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (7.5.23-4):

C. Hearing about, praising, remembering, serving the feet of, worshiping, bowing to, servitude towards, friendship with, and offering oneself to Viṣṇu; if *bhakti* with those nine characteristics, offered to Viṣṇu, is performed by a person directly for the Lord, I consider that the highest kind of education.

सत्सेवा गुरुसेवा च देवभावेन चेद्भवेत् ।  
 तदैषा भगवद्भक्तिर्लभ्यते नान्यथा क्वचित् ॥ १ ॥

1. There should be service of the holy and service of the guru as if they were the deity. Then this *bhakti* to the Lord is attained; never in any other way.

देवभावेन सत्सेवा यथा तैत्तिरीयके (तै. उ., १.११.२):

अतिथिदेवो भव ॥ (क) ॥

Service to the holy as deity as in the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (1.11.2):

1a. Become one whose deity is the guest.

तया तद्भक्तिर्यथा श्रीभागवते (भा. पु., ७.५.३२):

नैषां मतिस्तावदुरुक्रमाङ्घ्रिं  
 स्पृष्ट्यनर्थापगमो यदर्थः ।  
 महीयसां पादरजोऽभिषेकं  
 निष्किञ्चनानां न वृणीत यावत् ॥ (ख) ॥

By that [service of the holy] his [Kṛṣṇa's] *bhakti* [is attained], as in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (7.5.32):

1b. As long as their minds do not choose consecration by the dust of the feet of the great ones who are without any worldly possessions they will not touch the feet of Urukrama [Viṣṇu], the result of which is the removal of harmful things.<sup>1</sup>

देवभावेन गुरुसेवा यथा तैत्तिरीयके (तै. उ., १.११.२):

आचार्यदेवो भव ॥ (ग) ॥

Service of the guru as deity as in the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (1.11.2):

1c. Become one whose deity is the teacher.<sup>2</sup>

श्वेताश्वतरोपनिषदि च (श्वे. उ., ६.२२):

यस्य देवे परा भक्तिर्यथा देवे तथा गुरौ ।  
 तस्यैते कथिता ह्यर्थाः प्रकाशन्ते महात्मनः ॥ (घ) ॥

And in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (6.22):

1d. To the great-souled one who has the highest *bhakti* towards his deity and as to deity towards his guru the topics narrated here are revealed.

तया तद्भक्तिर्यथा श्रीभागवते (भा. पु., ११.३.२१-२२):

<sup>1</sup>Kṛṣṇadeva glosses harmful things (*anārtha*) as the cycle of rebirth and redeath (*samsṛti*).

<sup>2</sup>Kṛṣṇadeva says that teacher means the one who teaches (or gives) one the *mantra* here. This refers to the *mantra* initiation called *dīkṣā* after which one becomes a full member of the Vaiṣṇava community.

तस्माद् गुरुं प्रपद्येत जिज्ञासुः श्रेय उत्तमम् ।  
 शाब्दे परे च निष्णातं ब्रह्मण्युपशमाश्रयम् ॥  
 तत्र भागवतान् धर्मान् शिक्षेद् गुर्वात्मदैवतः ।  
 अमाययाऽनुवृत्त्या यैस्तुष्येदात्मात्मदो हरिः ॥ (ङ) ॥  
 (भा. पु., ११.३.२१-२२)

By that [service of the guru] his [Kṛṣṇa's] *bhakti* [is attained] as in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (11.3.21-22):

1e. Therefore, one who wants to know the ultimate good should approach a guru who is immersed in verbal Brahman [Veda] and the supreme Brahman and who is an abode of peace. In his presence, with the guru as his deity and with guileless service he should learn the teachings relating to the deity by which Hari, the Self himself and the giver of the Self, will be pleased.

अवाप्तपञ्चसंस्कारो लब्धद्विविधभक्तिकः ।  
 साक्षात्कृत्य हरिं तस्य धाम्नि नित्यं प्रमोदते ॥ २ ॥

2. One who has received the five sacraments and obtained [one of] the two types of *bhakti*, after directly meeting Hari rejoices eternally in his abode.

तत्र पञ्च संस्कारा यथा स्मृतौ:

तापः पुण्ड्रं तथा नाम मन्त्रो यागश्च पञ्चमः ।  
 अमी हि पञ्च संस्काराः परमैकान्तिहेतवः ॥ (ग) ॥

In that, the five sacraments as found in traditional texts (*smṛti*):

2a. The brand, the mark, the name, the *mantra*, and the worship as the fifth. These five sacraments are the causes of the highest single-mindedness.

तापोऽत्र तप्तचक्रादिमुद्राधारणमुच्यते ।  
 तेनैव हरिनामादिमुद्रा चाप्युपलक्ष्यते ॥ ३ ॥



3. Here brand means wearing the burned marks of the discus and so forth. By that, however, is also intended the impressions of the names of Hari and so forth.<sup>3</sup>

सा यथा स्मृतौ:

हरिनामाक्षरैर्गात्रमङ्कयेच्चन्दनादिना ।  
स लोकपावनो भूत्वा तस्य लोकमाप्नुयात् ॥ ३अ ॥

That [impressions of the names of Hari] as [described] in traditional texts:

3a. One should mark the body with the syllables of the names of Hari with sandalwood, and so forth. One [doing so] becomes a purifier of the world and shall win his [Hari's] world.

पुण्ड्रं स्याद्द्व्यपुण्ड्रं तच्छास्त्रे बहुविधं स्मृतम् ।  
हरिमन्दिरतत्पादाकृत्याद्यतिशुभावहम् ॥  
नामात्र गदितं सद्भिर्हरिभृत्यत्वबोधकम् ।  
मन्त्रोऽष्टादशवर्णादिः स्वेष्टदेववपुर्मतः ॥  
शालग्रामादिपूजा तु यागशब्देन कथ्यते ।  
प्रमाणान्येषु दृश्यानि पुराणादिषु साधुभिः ॥ ४ ॥

4. Mark is the upward mark, which in scripture is remembered to be of many types. Having the forms of the temple of Hari or of his feet, it is very auspicious. Name here is said by the saintly to be a name that makes known that one is a servant of Hari. Mantra is considered to be the form of one's preferred deity consisting of eighteen syllables and so forth. Worship of the *śālagrāma* stone and so forth is meant by the word "worship" (*yāga*). The evidence for these can be found by the saintly in the Purāṇas and other scriptures.

<sup>3</sup>Kṛṣṇadeva remarks that Śrī Caitanya, thinking the wearing of those brands too difficult for people whose minds were polluted by the Age of Kali and yet desiring to save the fallen, taught instead the wearing of the markings of the names of Kṛṣṇa with sandalwood, a practice also accepted by the ancients.

नवधा भक्तिर्विधिरुचिपूर्वा द्वेधा भवेद्यया कृष्णः ।  
भूत्वा स्वयं प्रसन्नो ददाति तत्तदीप्सितं धाम ॥ ५ ॥

5. Ninefold *bhakti* is of two types: that motivated by injunction and that preceded by desire.<sup>4</sup> Kṛṣṇa himself becomes pleased by it and bestows the various desired abodes.<sup>5</sup>

विधिनाभ्यर्च्यते देवश्चतुर्बाह्वादिरूपधृक् ।  
रुच्यात्मकेन तेनासौ नृलिङ्गः परिपूज्यते ॥ ६ ॥

6. The deity is worshiped by injunction in forms like the four-armed and so forth. By desire he is worshiped with human characteristics.<sup>6</sup>

तुलस्यश्चत्थधात्र्यादिपूजनं धामनिष्ठता ।  
अरुणोदयविद्धस्तु सन्त्याज्यो हरिवासरः ।  
जन्माष्टम्यादिकं सूर्योदयविद्धं परित्यजेत् ॥ ७ ॥

7. [One should] honor *tulasī*, the holy fig tree, the *āmalaka* plant, and so

<sup>4</sup>Akṣaya Kumāra Śāstrī quotes Viśvanātha Cakravartin's short characterization of *bhakti* in his *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu-bindu* :

*Bhakti* is *bhakti* as practice [cultivation], as feeling, and as love. *Bhakti* as practice is again twofold depending on whether it is rule initiated (*vaidhī*) or passionate (*rāgānugā*). The definition of rule-initiated is: if one performs hearing, glorifying and so forth out of fear of the punishments described in scripture then it is rule oriented *bhakti*. And passionate: if one performs them out of a strong desire to gain the service of one's desired one, the son of the king of Vraja [Kṛṣṇa], then it is passionate *bhakti*.

<sup>5</sup>It is believed that those who have the different types of *bhakti* as practice attain different eternal abodes.

<sup>6</sup>Here the different objects of Vaiṣṇava worship are correlated to the different types of *bhakti* as practice. The four-armed, eight-armed, and ten-armed forms of Viṣṇu are the objects of rule initiated *bhakti* and the more human-like forms such as Kṛṣṇa and Rāma encourage the response of passion pursuant *bhakti*.

forth<sup>7</sup> and reside in the holy land.<sup>8</sup> The Ekādaśī fast should be given up when pierced by the arrival of dawn, and celebrations like Janmāṣṭamī when pierced by the rise of the sun.<sup>9</sup>

लोकसङ्ग्रहमन्विच्छन्नित्यनैमित्तिकं बुधः ।  
प्रतिष्ठितश्चरेत् कर्म भक्तिप्राधान्यमत्यजन् ॥ ८ ॥

8. Desiring to encourage ordinary people a wise one, well established in life, should perform rites both daily and occasional without giving up the superiority of *bhakti*.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup>The *tulasī* plant is a plant sacred to Viṣṇu that is related to the sweet basil plant and is often referred to as sacred basil. It is found in Hindu temples and pious Hindu homes. It is often ritually prayed to, offered water and circumambulated. The holy fig or banyan tree is a tree that can get quite large. Branches may shoot down into the ground and become additional roots allowing it to spread over large areas. One of the commentators quotes Jīva Gosvāmin who says that the banyan tree is a symbol of Viṣṇu's greatness and thus is to be honored. The "so forth" stands for cows, brāhmaṇas, and Vaiṣṇavas.

<sup>8</sup>Residence in the holy land means living in one of the holy places of pilgrimage, like Varanasi, Hardwar, etc. According to the tradition that this text is part of, the holiest of all places is that land in which Kṛṣṇa spent his childhood called Vraja (Braj) in the District of Mathura about ninety miles south of Delhi. Kṛṣṇadeva says that it is best to live in the holy land physically, but if that is not possible then in one's meditation one should live there.

<sup>9</sup>Ekādaśī (eleventh) is the eleventh day after the full or new moon. It is a fast day for observant Vaiṣṇava. On those days members of the renunciant community fast from both food and water until the next day. According to this author those days when they are 'pierced' by the arrival of dawn are not to be observed. Akṣaya Kumāra Śāstrī says the an Ekādaśī is pierced when dawn arrives before Ekādaśī begins according to the astrologers. Lunar days do not begin when solar days do. Thus, Ekādaśī might begin after the red of dawn occurs and such an Ekādaśī is considered pierced and is not to be observed. A similar ruling holds for other holy days like Janmāṣṭamī which is the birthday observance of Kṛṣṇa. In the later case the day is not observed if it is pierced by the rise of the sun (not the red of dawn).

<sup>10</sup>Kṛṣṇadeva identifies three kinds of candidates for *bhakti*: the self-concerned, the uninvolved, and the one concerned with surrounding society. The self-concerned, sticking to his own stage in life (i.e. student, householder, retired, or renounced), should perform all the rites prescribed for him that are without violence until the appearance of their results, remaining free of desire. The uninvolved, absorbed in Hari, should perform mental acts of worship of Hari. Without a stage in life he by nature gives up all rites. One concerned with surrounding society, though, who is situated in a stage of life and well established in life, if he has attained an important position, should perform rites for the benefit of the people and still perform *bhakti* as the purpose of those rites.

दश नामापराधांस्तु यत्नतः परिवर्जयेत् ॥ ९ ॥

9. The ten offenses to the Holy Name should be carefully avoided.<sup>11</sup>

कृष्णावाप्तिफला भक्तिरेकान्तात्राभिधीयते ।  
ज्ञानवैराग्यपूर्वा सा फलं सद्यः प्रकाशयेत् ॥ १० ॥

10. *Bhakti* whose fruit is the attainment of Kṛṣṇa is here called single-minded. Initiated by knowledge and renunciation, this will instantly manifest its fruit.

Thus ends the Eighth Truth  
entitled:  
"Bhakti Bestows Liberation"

---

<sup>11</sup>Kṛṣṇadeva points out that there are a number of offenses in service as well, such as going to the temple of Hari in a vehicle (instead of on foot) and so forth. Those, too, are to be avoided, but are cleansed away through constant service. They are described in the *Varāha Purāṇa*. Holy Name refers to the practice of singing or silently repeating the names of Hari. The ten offenses to the Holy Name are described in the *Padma Purāṇa*. Those, too, can be cleansed away by constant repetition of the Holy Name, but since, the commentator points out, that sort of constant repetition is weak (because of the interference of the offenses), one should avoid them with care. The ten offenses are: derision of holy men (1), considering the names of Śiva to be independent of Viṣṇu (2), disrespect for the guru (3), derision of the Veda and scriptures following the Veda (4), considering the greatness of the Holy Name to be mere eulogy (5), imagining the meaning of the Holy Name in some other way (6), engaging in sinful acts on the strength of the Holy Name (7), considering other auspicious actions to be equal to the Holy Name (8), teaching the Holy Name to the unfaithful or the inimical (9), not being pleased when one hears of the greatness of the Holy Name (10).

## Chapter 9

### Ninth Truth: Three are the Sources of Knowledge

अथ प्रत्यक्षानुमानशब्दानामेव प्रमाणत्वम् ।

यथा श्रीभागवते (भा. पु., ११.१९.१७):

श्रुतिः प्रत्यक्षमैतिह्यमनुमानं चतुष्टयम् ॥ (क) ॥

Now, the sources of knowledge: perception, inference, and testimony.

As stated in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (11.19.17):

A. Revelation [the Veda or simply testimony], perception, tradition, and inference are the four [sources of knowledge].<sup>1</sup>

प्रत्यक्षेऽन्तर्भवेद् यस्मादैतिह्यं तेन देशिकः ।

प्रमाणं त्रिविधं प्राख्यत्तत्र मुख्या श्रुतिर्भवेत् ॥ १ ॥

<sup>1</sup>According to the commentators “revelation” refers primarily to the Veda in this tradition. In a more expanded sense it refers to the source of knowledge called testimony (*śabda*), that is, the words of authorities in the areas of their expertise. The words of the Veda represent the highest authority. Perception is defined as the senses in contact with the objects of the senses. Tradition is the statement of unknown speakers handed down from generation to generation. An example of tradition supplied by one of the commentators is the story that a ghost lives in a certain tree. Inference is the means to inferential knowledge.

1. Since tradition should be included in perception the teacher [Madhva] stated that there are three sources of knowledge and among them revelation is the primary one.<sup>2</sup>

प्रत्यक्षमनुमानञ्च यत्साचिव्येन शुद्धिमत् ।  
 मायामुण्डावलोकादौ प्रत्यक्षं व्यभिचारि यत् ॥ २ ॥  
 अनुमा चातिधूमेऽद्रौ वृष्टिनिर्वापिताग्निके ।  
 अतः प्रमाणं तत्तच्च स्वतन्त्रं नैव सम्मतम् ॥ ३ ॥

2-3. Since perception and inference are corrected with the assistance of it [revelation], and since perception in the case of seeing an illusory head is misleading, as is inference in a case in which a fire on a very smoky mountain has been put out by rain, those two are not considered independent sources of knowledge.

अनुकूलो मतस्तर्कः शुष्कस्तु परिवर्जितः ॥ ४ ॥

4. Argument in conformity is accepted; dry argument is rejected.<sup>3</sup>

तथाहि वाजसनेयिनः (बृ. उ., २.४.५):

आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः  
 ॥ (क) ॥

<sup>2</sup>The reasoning behind including tradition in perception is that knowledge derived from tradition was a matter of perception for the first person or the originator of the tradition. In the example given “a ghost lives in this banyan tree,” the originator of that tradition must have perceived something that made him come to that conclusion. From him it was passed down from person to person until it reaches us today as a tradition. Therefore, in spite of the statement in the *Purāṇa* identifying four sources of knowledge, there are really only three. Kṛṣṇadeva cites a passage from the *Laws of Manu* (*Manu-smṛiti*), as added support:

Perception, inference, and scripture coming down in various ways: these three should be well known by someone wishing for purity of religious life.

Revelation or the Veda, because it is not man-made, is the foremost of them. It produces knowledge of the highest truths.

<sup>3</sup>Argument in conformity means according to the commentators argument that supports the meaning of revelation. Dry argument is argument simply for the sake of argument.

As stated in the *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (2.4.5):

4a. The self is to be seen, heard of, contemplated, meditated on.<sup>4</sup>

काठकाः (क. उ., २.९):

नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया प्रोक्तान्येन सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्ट ॥ (ख)  
॥

And in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* (2.9):

4b. This insight cannot be accomplished by argument. Presented by another it leads to right knowledge, dearest one.<sup>5</sup>

स्मृतिश्च

पूर्वापराविरोधेन कोऽत्रार्थोऽभिमतो भवेत् ।  
इत्याद्यमूहनं तर्कः शुष्कतर्कन्तु वर्जयेत् ॥ (ग) ॥

And in the traditional texts:

4c. What meaning would fit here without contradicting former or later statements, such postulation is argument. Dry argument should be rejected.

नावेदविदुषां यस्माद्ब्रह्मधीरुपजायते ।  
यच्चौपनिषदं ब्रह्म तस्मान्मुख्या श्रुतिर्मता ॥ ५ ॥

5. Since knowledge of Brahman does not occur for those who do not know the Veda and since Brahman is established in the Upaniṣads, revelation is considered the main [source].

तथाहि श्रुतिः (बृ. उ., ३.९.२६)

<sup>4</sup>This statement is considered to encompass the whole Vedāntic process. The self, here glossed as Hari, is to be directly experienced (seen). The process begins with hearing from a teacher. Then one is to ascertain what one has heard by argument that conforms to the Veda and finally, one is to meditate on what has been ascertained, i.e. the self.

<sup>5</sup>Argument or inference alone cannot produce insight. One needs another, the teacher, for that.

नावेदविन् मनुते तं बृहन्तम् ॥ इति ॥  
औपनिषदं पुरुषं पृच्छामि ॥ (क) ॥

As stated in revelation (*Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, 3.9.26):

5a. One who does not know the Veda does not understand that great one.  
I inquire after that person taught in the Upaniṣads.

Thus ends the Ninth Truth  
entitled:  
"Three Sources of Knowledge"



# Chapter 10

## Conclusion

एवमुक्तं प्राचा

श्रीमध्वमते हरिः परतमः सत्यं जगत् तत्त्वतो  
भेदो जीवगणा हरेरनुचरा नीचोच्चभावे गताः ।  
मुक्तिर्नैजसुखानुभूतिरमला भक्तिश्च तत्साधनम्  
अक्षादित्रितयं प्रमाणमखिलाम्नायैकवेद्यो हरिः ॥ १ ॥

Thus it is said by the prior teacher:

1. In Madhva's view Hari is the highest, the world and difference are truly real, living beings are the attendants of Hari and are lower and higher, liberation is the experience of one's own happiness, pure *bhakti* is the means to that, the three headed by perception are the sources of knowledge, and Hari is the one subject of all scriptures.

आनन्दतीर्थै रचितानि यस्यां  
प्रमेयरत्नानि नवैव सन्ति ।  
प्रमेयरत्नावलिरादरेण  
प्रधीभिरेषा हृदये निधेया ॥ २ ॥

2. May the wise respectfully place in their hearts the *Necklace of Truth-Jewels*, in which is found the nine jewel-like truths fashioned by Ānandatīrtha.

नित्यं निवसतु हृदये चैतन्यात्मा मुरारिर्नः ।  
 निरवद्यो निर्वृतिमान् गजपतिरनुकम्पया यस्य ॥ ३ ॥

3. May Murāri whose very self is Caitanya [consciousness] always reside in my heart. By his mercy the lord of the elephants<sup>1</sup> became free of sin and full of joy.

Thus ends *The Necklace of Truth-Jewels* by Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa.

---

<sup>1</sup>A reference to the king of Orissa who was probably a patron of an important guru in Baladeva's line, Rasika Murāri.

# Appendix A

## A Brief Overview of Advaita Vedānta by Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya Śāstrī

[This essay is translated from “Advaitavedānter Digdarśan” in the *Bhāratīya Darśana Koṣa*, edited by Srimohan Bhattacharya and Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya Śāstrī (Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1981), vol. 3, part 1, pp. 159-190.]

### A.1 Orthodox and Heterodox

Among all of the Indian *darśana*,<sup>1</sup> the six, Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Sāṅkhya, Pātañjala, Pūrva Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta, are called orthodox (*āstika*). The meaning of this is that they accept the Veda as authoritative. Those that do not accept the Veda as authoritative or that censure the Veda are heterodox (*nāstika*) (नास्तिको वेदनिन्दकः). Even though Sāṅkhya and Pūrva Mīmāṃsā do not accept (the existence of) a god they are not called heterodox.

---

<sup>1</sup>The term *darśana* is a technical term that means literally seeing or viewing. It is sometimes translated by the word “philosophy,” but that seems often inappropriate in the Indic context.

## A.2 The Meaning of *Darśana*

Even though the word *darśana* generally means vision or optical perception, one should understand *darśana* here as seeing with the mind's eye or with the intellect. In words like "complete seeing" (*saṃyag-darśana*), correct seeing (*yathārtha-darśana*), and so forth, it is used in that sense. By the word *darśana* one should primarily understand direct experience. It has been said in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* "[the self is seen] by the single-pointed intellect," (दृश्यते त्वग्यया बुद्ध्या). Although direct experience is the chief meaning of *darśana*, indirect knowledge with the help of text or instruction can be a secondary meaning of the word. Therefore, both of those meanings of the word *darśana* are acceptable.

## A.3 The Discipline of "Seeing" (*Darśana*) and Vedānta as a Way of Seeing

That discipline (*śāstra*) by which are perceived the unchanging truths or the highest truth in the living beings and the world, which are perceived as constantly changing, first indirectly and then directly, by some prescribed method or practice, is the discipline of "seeing" (*darśana*). That discipline among the orthodox *darśana* which clarifies the conclusions or meanings of the Upaniṣads, primarily on the basis of the Vedānta or Upaniṣads is called Vedānta *darśana*. That Upaniṣadic way of seeing is the Vedānta *darśana*. Even though, when one mentions Vedānta, one generally understands the Non-dual form of Vedānta (Advaita Vedānta), many other kinds of *darśana* or explanation of the *Brahma-sūtra* of Vyāsa, created by many exemplary teachers, are found. All those *darśana*, whether teaching dualism (Dvaita), qualified non-dualism (Viśiṣṭādvaita), or pure non-dualism (Śuddhādvaita), are referred to as Vedānta in their respective traditions. Nevertheless, by Vedānta one generally means Advaita or Non-dual Vedānta or the Upaniṣadic *darśana*. It is found that when referring to the Upaniṣadic way of seeing, the followers of which in ancient times argued against the Buddhists and others, one means the Advaita Vedānta.

## A.4 Advaita Vedānta

Whatever has attained the nature of two is dualistic.<sup>2</sup> That in which there is this kind of dual nature is not non-dual. “What illusion or what lamentation is there for one who sees oneness?”<sup>3</sup> “In Brahman (the highest truth) there is no plurality.”<sup>4</sup> “One who sees here plurality attains death after death.”<sup>5</sup> There are hundreds of Upanṣadic statements like these that are the root sources of the Advaita Vedānta way of seeing. Beyond that there is argumentation and the experience of the learned, too. The discipline of seeing that was created on the basis of the tradition of all the revealed texts by famous teachers such as the author of the *Brahma-sūtra* Vyāsa, Gauḍapāda, Śaṅkara is known by the name of Advaita Vedānta.

## A.5 Vedānta’s Three Points of Departure

There are three points of departure, or three paths or divisions of instruction in Vedānta: the revealed texts (*śruti*), the traditional texts (*smṛti*), and logic (*nyāya*). The Upaniṣads, which are the essential core or the import of the Veda, are the revealed point of departure. The *Bhagavad-gītā* which was taught by the Lord Śrī Kṛṣṇa as the essence of the Upaniṣads is the traditional point of departure. The *Brahma-sūtra* or *Śārīraka-sūtra* written by Bādarāyaṇa Vyāsa is the logical point of departure of Vedānta, because in it the Upaniṣadic way of seeing is established by argument or reflection. In this text, the “embodied” (*śārīraka*) or the living being’s true nature is determined. Therefore it is called the *Śārīraka-sūtra*.

## A.6 The Highest Principle in Advaita Vedānta

The foundation and final conclusion of this Vedānta, divided as it is into its three points of departure, is this: the one and only truth is Brahman

<sup>2</sup>द्विधेतं द्वीतमित्याहुस्तद्भावो द्वैतमुच्यते, (बृहदारण्यक वार्त्तिक, ४.३.१६८)

<sup>3</sup>को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः

<sup>4</sup>नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन

<sup>5</sup>मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति

whose nature is pure, unqualified consciousness. This is the highest truth, the absolute truth. Since consciousness, whose nature is manifestation, is self-evident and does not depend on proof or on anything else, it is the absolute and highest truth. There can be no question of evidence in relation to this consciousness because only if one already accepts consciousness or experience is the category of evidence established.<sup>6</sup>

This consciousness substance is unqualified or without characteristic. Since all qualities or characteristics are revealed by consciousness or rather are objects manifested by consciousness, no characteristic can be a characteristic of consciousness. Just as pots and cloth and so forth are revealed by consciousness and thus cannot be characteristics of consciousness, so too all characteristics are illumined or revealed by consciousness and cannot belong to it. Characteristics like existence, consciousness-ness, etc., are merely attributed to consciousness in common usage. They are apart from consciousness which has no characteristic. Its purpose is to exclude the false, to exclude the inanimate.

Moreover, consciousness is changeless, or, in other words, there can be no transformation, modification, or revolution of consciousness. A substance's transformation or change is possible in two ways: a change of characteristics and a change in nature. Since consciousness has no characteristics, change in its characteristics is impossible. If consciousness' nature were to change it would become unconscious or inanimate. That, too, is impossible, because if consciousness were to become unconscious no knowledge or awareness would remain in the world: "the blindness of the world would follow" (जगदान्ध्यं प्रसज्येत). Therefore, the consciousness substance is without characteristics and changeless.

However, even if one accepts consciousness or Brahman, whose nature is pure consciousness, as the highest truth, how can one accept that as the only or unseconded truth? Where did this diverse universal manifestation that we perceive come from? While this universe exists how

---

<sup>6</sup>न हि आत्मा आत्मनः प्रमाणमपेक्ष्य सिध्यति, आत्मा तु प्रमाणादिव्यवहाराश्रयत्वात् प्रागेव प्रमाणादिव्यवहारात् सिध्यति । (ब्रह्. सू., शाङ्ख. भा., २.३.७) and

आत्मानुभवमाश्रित्य प्रत्यक्षादि प्रसिध्यति ।

अनुभूतेः स्वतःसिद्धेः कापेक्षा ह्यात्मसिद्धये ॥ (१८९ सम्बन्धवार्तिक)

can consciousness-brahman be without a second? In answer to this it is said that since the universal manifestation depends on consciousness or on sources of knowledge it is not ultimate or absolute truth. From an absolute perspective it was not created either. There is nothing such as an absolute creation. This universal manifestation is a mere appearance of Brahman. But the question nevertheless remains: what is the cause of the appearance and to whom is this appearance appearing? Or, how is appearance possible in pure, unqualified Brahman?

## A.7 Brahman's Power or Māyā

In resolving these problems it is said that there is in the supreme and pure Brahman a non-supreme, beginningless power that is the cause of both dependence on consciousness and the transformation which is called *māyā* or ignorance.<sup>7</sup> Since Brahman's power is illumined by consciousness it has no independent existence apart from consciousness, or rather, it is not a separate principle.

Since this power of Brahman, known as ignorance, has no independent existence and is therefore not supreme, its existence in dependence on Brahman or its conditional existence does not destroy the non-duality of the supreme, non-dual Brahman. This is the conclusion of Advaita Vedānta. In Brahman there is the ignorance-power. For that reason, Brahman is said to be the cause of the universe and so forth. All these statements are conditional statements, the statements of living beings under the power of that ignorance. On the level of the highest truth all those things are not in Brahman.<sup>8</sup> Brahman is eternal, unblemished, and without a second. This *māyā*-power or ignorance has two types of force: a covering power and a projecting power. The covering power covers the true nature of Brahman producing the mistaken perceptions and usages: "there is no non-dual Brahman; it is not revealed." The projecting power produces the mistakes of attributing to Brahman "I am the agent; I am the enjoyer; I am happy; I

<sup>7</sup>निस्तत्त्वा कार्यगम्यास्य शक्तिर्मायाग्निशक्तिवत् । (पञ्चदशी, २.४७)

<sup>8</sup>अविद्यास्येत्यविद्यायामेवासित्वा प्रकल्प्यते ।

ब्रह्मदृष्ट्या त्वविद्येयं न कथंचन युज्यते ॥ (सम्बन्ध-वार्तिक, १३६)

am sad," and so forth; and thus the illusions of being a living being (*jīva*), [or of there being] a god, or of there being a universe, are produced.<sup>9</sup>

There is a statement in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* that from the non-dual Brahman has come creation: *sadeva saumya idamagra āsīdekamevādvitīyam ... tadaikṣata bahu syāṃ prajāyeya, tattejo'asṛjata* and so forth (Chānd. U., 6.2.1-3). Its meaning is that before creation the real alone existed, free of all kinds of difference, ie., internal, intra-species, and inter-species differences. That beheld or rather reflected: "I will become many; I will become born." That created heat and so forth. Here one must understand that by this word "the real" (*sat*) is meant Brahman which is consciousness joined with the unmanifested power of *māyā*. Otherwise, there would be no possibility for it of "seeing" or "becoming many" or "being born." From that conditional power of *māyā* the conditional creation of the conditional world occurred. It has no self-established or ultimate substance at all. On the chest of consciousness or Brahman, the play of this power of *māyā* goes on like the play of the clouds in the sky. Since there is nothing apart from Brahman, one has to say that Brahman is the support of the power of *māyā* or ignorance.<sup>10</sup> Still, this being the foundation or the support (like the reflection of a tree in a pond) does not mean actual support. In the same way that a rope is the support or substratum of a superimposed snake, it is superimposed support. Therefore, it is said that *māyā* and all its effects are imposed on or attributed to Brahman whose nature is consciousness. In something real something unreal resides in an ascribed way or in a superimposed relationship of identity. The real (Brahman) is the superimposed substratum or location of the unreal (ignorance and its effects).<sup>11</sup> The creation by *māyā* or ignorance on the substratum of the real is called superimposition. From another angle, being able to understand the universal manifestation as superimposed, having understood, from the point of view of reflection or knowledge, that all effects are not other than their causes, is called refutation (*apavāda*).<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup>आच्छाद्य विक्षिपति संस्फुरदात्मरूपं  
जीवेश्वरत्वजगदाकृतिभिर्मृषैव ।  
अज्ञानमावरणविभ्रमशक्तियोगाद्  
आत्ममात्रविषयताश्रयताबलेन ॥ (संक्षेपशारीक, १.२०)

<sup>10</sup>आश्रयत्वविषयत्वभागिनी विनिर्भासचित्तिरेव केवला । (संक्षेपशारीक, १.३१९)

<sup>11</sup>अज्ञानस्याश्रयो ब्रह्मेत्यधिष्ठानतया जगुः ।

<sup>12</sup>See the *Vedānta-sāra* (paras. 109-112) and *Pañcadaśī* (7.43).



## A.8 The Seeing and the Seen

In the *Siddhānta-bindu* Madhusūdana has said: “In the opinion of Advaita Vedānta, there are two types of categories, the seeing and the seen.” Among them, the seeing category is self-manifesting (manifestation without depending on another) pure consciousness. This is by nature self-established and non-dual. By this, all the other categories (the seen) are manifested and established. The seeing category, whose nature is consciousness, cannot be manifested or established by any source of knowledge (*pramāṇa*) or by anything else. Since all sources of knowledge headed by perception are established by consciousness, the sources cannot establish or prove consciousness which is established prior to them.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, consciousness or the seeing category is self-established and since this is uncontradicted in the three times (past, present, and future), that is, it is not destroyed or changed in the three times, it is the highest principle or truth.

The other category, the seen, is all material things manifested or illumined by the seeing consciousness. Ignorance and all the effects of ignorance that are pervaded by it, or in other words the whole universal appearance beginning with space, falls within this category of the seen. In the conclusion of Advaita, ignorance and its effect, the universal appearance, being superimposed on the seeing category, consciousness, or being created by ignorance, are not absolute, but rather are false. They are, in other words, distinct from the real and the unreal. Nevertheless, since its conditional existence is accepted and since with the help of the intellect, the teacher, the scripture and the rest, which are within it [ignorance], one attains forms of worship and knowledge of the truth, and since the highest goal of human life, attainment of a fully joyful nature, becomes possible, description of the seen category is not without its uses.

The seen category is established by the witness and by the sources of knowledge. Ignorance, mind and its qualities, knowledge, happiness, etc. are established by witness. The universal appearance beginning with space is established by the sources of knowledge: perception, inference, scripture, and so forth. This seen category in the forms of the causal, subtle, and gross is threefold: unmanifest, formless, and formed. That igno-

<sup>13</sup>आत्मानुभवमाश्रित्य प्रत्यक्षादि प्रसिध्यति । (सम्बन्ध-वार्तिक, १८९)

rance which is the seed power of the formed and unformed and which is joined with the reflection of the seeing consciousness is the unmanifest. From this comes the creation of the manifest world of the subtle and the gross, the formless and the formed.

Previously it was said that ignorance as mind and its characteristics (happiness, sadness, and so forth) is established by the witness. This witness is a type of the seeing consciousness. Though the seeing category is by nature one, it becomes threefold in relationship with the limiting factors (*upādhi*), ignorance, mind, and so forth, from within the seen. Deity, the living being, and the witness, these three are the distinctions in the one seeing consciousness brought about by the limiting factors.<sup>14</sup> Among them, the seeing consciousness that is reflected in the ignorance that is the cause of all is the deity (*īśvara*, i.e. seeing consciousness limited by ignorance is deity). The seeing consciousness that is reflected in the mind (or seeing consciousness reflected in ignorance delimited by the mind and its impressions) is the living being (*jīva*). In this way one arrives at deity and the living being. The seeing consciousness that is the image of which those two are reflections is the witness (*sākṣī*). (In the opinion of some, deity is the image, not a reflection. For them the deity himself is therefore the witness. The author of the *Vārtika* is of this view and for him there are only two types of the seeing category: deity and the living being. The deity is himself the witness.)

Here one may question why the witness is accepted as different from the deity and the living being. The answer is that since the living being changes as a knower, as happy, as sad and so forth, it cannot be the actual self (*ātman*). Thus, the viewer of the living being's transformations of happiness and sadness and such cannot be the living being itself, because if that were so, the fault of contradiction between actor and object of action would occur. Therefore, one has to accept the witness as the one who perceives the knowing living being's own changes.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>*Siddhānta-bindu*, verse 8.

<sup>15</sup>विकारित्वेन स्वविकारसाक्षित्वानुपपत्तेर्दृश्यस्य द्रष्टृत्वाभावात् । Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, *Siddhānta-bindu* (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 3rd edition, 1986), p. 20).

## A.9 The Three Categories of Advaita Vedānta

In another manner it can be said that, in the final judgment, Advaita categories are of three sorts. The first is the “self-established or self-dependent,” the second is “established by the witness” and the third is “established by the sources of knowledge.” Among these, the self-established is the consciousness-self. Since it is the self-established or independent truth it is the highest truth. Since the internal categories like ignorance, knowledge, the mind, happiness, sadness, and so forth are directly manifested to the consciousness in the form of the witness, these are called witness-established, the second type. Since these are not covered by ignorance or have no unknown existence, the operation of the sources of knowledge is not necessary for their manifestation. In order for the covering of ignorance of all those categories whose existence is unknown, like pots and cloth and so forth, to be removed and for them to be revealed, there is need of the sources of knowledge [perception, inference, and so forth]. All of these external categories like pots and cloth are established, therefore, by the sources of knowledge. Mental states produced by the senses, by knowledge of pervasion, by sound (speech), and so forth are called sources of knowledge. The coverings of ignorance are destroyed by them.

Since ignorance, knowledge, happiness, and distress which are established by the witness, and pots, cloth, and so forth which are established by the sources of knowledge are not self-established or independent truths, they are conditional truths. These all are superimposed on the self/consciousness or are concocted by ignorance.

There is one other type of witness-established category as in the cases of the rope and the serpent, the shell and silver, and so forth. Since they are produced, apart from the general fault of ignorance, by incidental faults like dullness, darkness, and so forth, they are said to be seeming truth (*prātibhāsika-satya*). Since they, too, have no unknown existence, there is no necessity for the sources of knowledge to destroy the covering of ignorance. For that reason these, too, are established by the witness like happiness and sadness. Since the category of root ignorance is established by the seeing, it is a category fabricated on Brahman/consciousness (consciousness-self). In other words, since its existence is established by consciousness or is dependent on consciousness, it, too, has conditional

existence. In the opinion of those who subscribe to the view of creation by glancing, certainly the root ignorance in the living beings is also seeming truth, and its effect, the universal manifestation, too, is seeming truth. For them, there is nothing conditional. However, this view is not supported by the author of the *Brahma-sūtra* or the commentator, the great teacher Śaṅkara.<sup>16</sup>

A question can be raised here. It was said that since root ignorance is fabricated it is conditional truth. Who is the fabricator of this constructed ignorance? One cannot say Brahman because if that were so, one would have to accept yet another ignorance in Brahman as the root or source of the fabrication of ignorance. For, it is under the influence of ignorance that false things are fabricated. Moreover, one would have to accept Brahman as ignorant or gripped by ignorance. One cannot say that the living being is the fabricator of ignorance, because the living being is itself fabricated by ignorance and thus cannot be the fabricator of ignorance.

In answer it is said that as the root or material cause of all fabrication, ignorance has to be accepted as fabricated. The material cause of the whole fabricated world-manifestation cannot be unfabricated or absolute. For this reason ignorance is a fabricated category and there is no need for another, separate fabricator. Moreover, since this root ignorance is beginningless it does not require a fabricator. In addition, since this ignorance, which is the consciousness-self's ignorance, is illumined by consciousness, or in other words, since it is part of the seen, it is fabricated like other members of the category of the seen, shell and silver, for instance. Furthermore, since an actual union between ignorance and the self-manifesting self is impossible, ignorance is fabricated. Since ignorance is different from the real and the unreal it is false, and since it is false it is fabricated. In Advaita Vedānta that which is different from the real or different from the real and unreal is called false (*mithyā*). The real is Brahman, uncontradicted in the three times. The unreal is the untrue like a son of a barren woman and so forth. Since it is known by perception and the rest, this rope-snake or universal manifestation is not untrue like the son of a barren woman. It is different from the real and the unreal; it is false. Among those again, the confusion of rope as snake produced by accidental faults like dullness, darkness, and so forth is seeming truth (*prātibhāsika-satya*). Only the universal manifesta-

---

<sup>16</sup>वैधर्म्याच्च न स्वप्नादिवत् । (ब्रह्. सू., २.२.१९)

tion which has an unknown existence produced by the fault of ignorance is conditional truth (*vyāvahārika-satya*).

It now has to be considered that though it has been said that things that have no unknown existence or covering by ignorance like rope-serpents and happiness and distress are directly known by the witness and that therefore for their perception there is no need of the operation of the sources of knowledge, yet, all these witness-known categories are still remembered. This is well known to all. If there is to be a memory, a latent impression (*saṃskāra*) is necessary, because a memory is not produced by the senses, but by latent impressions. Generally speaking, the destruction of a mental operation produces a latent impression. Therefore, if one does not have a mental operation whose object is a rope-snake and so forth, how can a latent impression of that object be produced and a memory occur? For this reason, even if one does not have a mental operation for the destruction of the covering of ignorance, a kind of subtle operation for the creation of memories or latent impressions is necessary in the case of all the things known directly by the witness, an operation of ignorance [directly]. A subtle operation or taking the form of an object either by that ignorance which is the seed or cause of the mind [the internal sense] or of the mind situated in ignorance is called an “operation of ignorance” (*avidyāvṛtti*). The perception of ignorance, happiness, distress, even memory is accepted as a form of this operation of ignorance. The perception of dream elephants and mistaken objects like rope-snakes is also an operation of ignorance, since in all these cases no covering has been destroyed by an operation of the mind or the internal sense, that is, there is no revelation of a previously existing but unknown object.<sup>17</sup>

Operations of ignorance such as memory, doubt, error, etc. are all sheltered in the witness-consciousness, not in the mind or ego [the knower]. Even though it is possible to justify the memories and latent impressions of happiness and distress and of rope-snakes in other ways, accepting an operation of ignorance in all those cases for the purpose of taking the form of the objects of the witness is reasonable. If taking the form of an object in connection with the witness were possible without any kind of operation, then the problem of the witness’ always being omniscient would arise. Therefore, it is reasonable to accept an operation of the mind in the case

---

<sup>17</sup> *Siddhānta-bindu*, pp.124-5.

of things like pots, cloth, and so forth that possess an unknown existence, and an operation of ignorance in the case of things like happiness, distress, and so on, and of rope-snakes and so forth that do not have an existence that is merely unknown. In order to justify the awareness of ignorance or of the deep-sleep darkness in deep sleep, from which arises the memory in someone who has arisen from sleep, “For so long, I was unable to know anything at all” (*na kiñcid avedīṣam*), one also must accept an operation of ignorance at the time of deep sleep. By means of an operation of ignorance in deep sleep, experience of ignorance at the time of deep sleep, of subtle joy and, in the opinion of some, of pure witness-consciousness occurs.<sup>18</sup> All these conclusions of Advaita Vedānta have been raised in the context of the discussion of the category of things established by the witness.

---

<sup>18</sup>साक्ष्याकारं सुखाकारमवस्थाऽज्ञानाकारं चाविद्याया वृत्तित्रयमभ्युपेयते । (सिद्धान्त-बिन्दु, पृ. १२०)

# Glossary

**abhidhā** The direct meaning or literal force of a word or sentence. Sometimes this is described as the denotative sense. Secondary signification is called *lakṣaṇā*. It is considered secondary because it depends on the primary force or signification, or more correctly, on the failure of primary signification. The usual example of the relationship between these two levels of meaning is found in the sentence: “the village is on the Ganges.” The literal or primary meaning, the *abhidhā*, of the sentence is that the village is sitting on top of the river called the Ganges. This is, of course, impossible. The literal meaning thus fails and another meaning is supplied to make sense of the sentence. That other meaning is “the village is on the bank of the Ganges,” The other meaning is the secondary meaning or *lakṣaṇā*. It is sometimes called the connotation or implied meaning.

**adhyāropa** Superimposition, imposing something that is not real on to something that is real. Just the idea of a snake is sometimes mistakenly superimposed on the reality of a rope, so the world of diversity is superimposed on the reality of Brahman, according to Advaita Vedānta.

**antaraṅga-śakti** The internal, intimate, or higher power of deity according to Vaiṣṇava Vedānta. It is one of the three main powers belonging to deity. The internal power is itself often sub-divided into three aspects or forces: pleasure-power (*hlādinī-śakti*), consciousness-power (*saṁvit -śakti*), and connecting or being-power (*sandhinī-śakti*). According to Baladeva in his *Siddhānta-ratna* ( [5], p.39-40; [6], p.77) the pleasure-power is “that by which [the deity], though by nature joy, enjoys and gives enjoyment,” consciousness-power is “that by

which he, though by nature consciousness, knows and makes known,” and being-power is “that by which he, though eternally existent by nature, exists and grants existence.”<sup>19</sup> The internal power is one, but it takes the form of one of these three forces depending on which of them manifests dominantly. These three forces correspond to the three aspects of the essential nature of the absolute: eternal being, consciousness, and bliss. See the entries for the other two main powers: the *taṭastha-śakti*, the liminal or marginal power, and the *bahiraṅga-śakti*, the external or exoteric power.

**antaḥkaraṇa** The internal faculty or instrument, sometimes loosely translated as mind. According to Vedānta, though it is one, it has four different functions and thus is given four names: mind (*manas*), intellect (*buddhi*), ego (*ahaṅkāra*), and imagination (*citta*). See the *Sāra*, paras. 61-66.

**apavāda** To disabuse, to free one from an illusion or error. According to Advaita Vedānta, when one is free from the deluding ignorance (*avidyā*) that covers Brahman and projects manifest cosmos onto it, the manifest universe devolves, effects returning into their causes, and in the end only Brahman remains. See. the *Sāra*, paras. 109-112.

**artha** The first of the approved goals of human life. *Artha* means wealth and property, the material goods that lead to survival and beyond that a comfortable life. The second goal of human life, according to Hinduism, is *kāma*, sensual enjoyment. Sensual enjoyment means eating fine foods, wearing fine cloth, using fine perfumes, and culminates in the pleasures of sexual enjoyment. As such it presupposes the accumulation of wealth and property (*artha*). The third goal is piety or religious duty (*dharma*). It involves performing acts of charity and other good deeds, along with engaging in religious ritual (sacrifice, worship, meditation, etc.). It covers both moral and ritual activity and produces merit which leads to good results in the future or in future lives. The final goal of human life is liberation. See the entry *mokṣa* for a discussion of that.

<sup>19</sup>तत्र सदात्मापि यया सत्तां धत्ते ददाति च सा सर्वदेशकालद्रव्यव्याप्तिहेतुः सन्धिनी । संविदात्मापि यया संवेत्ति संवेदयति च सा संवित् । ह्लादात्मापि यया ह्लादते ह्लादयति च सा ह्लादिनीति ॥



**āstika** The orthodox Hindu traditions. *Āstika* is derived from the Sanskrit word *asti* (third person, singular, of the verb *as*, “to be”) which means “it is,” and in its derived form means those who affirm, specifically those who affirm the Veda as revelatory. The *āstika* are then the “affirmers.” They are opposed by the *nāstika*, the deniers, those who deny the authority of the Veda (from *na asti*, “it is not”).

**avidyā** Primal ignorance, also known as *māyā*. *Māyā* means deceit, fraud, trick, enchantment, or illusion. It is the ignorance that through its two powers, covering and projecting, covers Brahman and projects the manifest world on it. It is the ignorance or enchantment that keeps living beings from realizing their true nature as Brahman, according to Advaita Vedānta. It neither is, nor is not, and is indescribable.

**bahiraṅga-śakti** The external power of the deity in Vaiṣṇava Vedānta. The external power is the power that creates, maintains, and destroys the manifest or material world. It is also referred to as the “lower” or “field” (*kṣetra*) power.

**Bhagavān** The lord, the deity as supreme person. Bhagavān is recognized as Viṣṇu or Kṛṣṇa in Vaiṣṇava Vedānta. *Bhagavat* is sometimes defined as the possessor of opulences (*bhaga*). Interestingly, one of the meanings of the word *bhaga* which makes up the first half of this word is vagina. This makes one meaning of the word *bhagavat* the possessor of a vagina (or of vaginas).

**bhakti** *Bhakti* is untranslatable, though it has often been translated as devotion, because it bears in some ways a certain similarity to the idea of religious devotion in the West. It comes from the Sanskrit root  $\sqrt{bha}$  which means to “to share or partake of,” “to practice or cultivate,” and “to enjoy or experience.” As such, the word *bhakti* applies both to a state of mind or feeling and to the set of practices aimed at cultivating that state of mind. As a set of practices, its purpose is to provide a number of ways in which to engage the mind and body of a person in a constant awareness of the deity. As a result of the long term execution of such practices it is believed that one develops a strong emotional attachment to the deity that eventually becomes love. The presence of this emotional attachment to the deity is also

believed to exert a powerful attraction on the deity, thus drawing the deity to the possessor of the attachment. *Bhakti* is thus also thought to be a kind of power. See the entry for *preman*.

**bhāṣya** The major commentary on the *sūtra*-work of a school of Hindu philosophy. In most of the schools or traditions there is only one *bhāṣya*. In Vedānta, however, there are numerous *bhāṣya*. Each school of Vedānta has its own *bhāṣya* on the *Brahma-sūtra*, the *sūtra*-work for all schools of Vedānta. Thus, the Advaita tradition has the *bhāṣya* of Śaṅkara (8th cent.) and the Caitanya tradition has the *bhāṣya* of Baladeva (18th cent.). The *bhāṣya* usually have numerous sub-commentaries and sub-sub-commentaries.

**Brahman** The impersonal absolute described in Advaita as eternal, all-pervading, non-dual, pure, consciousness. Brahman is from the root  $\sqrt{brh}$  which means to expand or increase. In its derived form it means the all-expanding, all-pervading. It is not limited by time, space, or object. In itself it is eternal existence, consciousness, and bliss. In relation to others, it is the cause of the universe in the way that a rope can be called the cause of the appearance of a snake.

**brāhmaṇa** This is the highest caste in the Hindu caste system. They are the priests, scholars, lawmakers, and ritualists. They or rather their ancestors are the architects of the rich and unbroken Hindu civilization, with its system of castes and stages of life, its vast wealth of literature on a wide variety of subjects, and its profound world-view. They are the keepers of the sacred texts and the sacred language, Sanskrit. The other castes have consented to their guidance and leadership and have inhabited the world the *brāhmaṇa* created and justified. They are the creators and transmitters of the Vedānta.

**darśana** A way of seeing, a philosophical school of thought. A *darśana* is a more or less fully articulated school of Indic philosophy. It is a way of seeing, not with the eyes, but with the mind. There are two traditional groups of *darśana* in India, the orthodox (*āstika*) and the heterodox (*nāstika*). The former are the Hindu schools that accept the authority of the Veda and latter are the Buddhist, Jaina, and Materialistic schools that do not accept the Veda.

**dharma** See the entry for *artha*.

**gopī** Cowherder girls. The most exemplary lovers of Kṛṣṇa according to the Vaiṣṇava Vedānta.

**jīva** The living being. *Jīva* is the term for the ordinary living beings that animate the universe. *Jīva* comes from the Sanskrit root  $\sqrt{jīv}$  which mean “to live.”

**jīvanmukti** Being liberated while living. This is the state of a living being after it gains liberation (*mukti*) and before its death. It has become disabused, in other words, while still living. Naturally, it sees things in a radically different way, according to all parties of Vedānta.

**kāma** See the entry for *artha*

**lakṣaṇā** See the entry for *abhidhā*.

**mahāvākya** The great propositions of the Upaniṣads according to the Advaita Vedānta. These are statements from the Upaniṣads that establish the oneness of the living beings and Brahman. The foremost of those is the statement *tat tvam asi*, “that you are (i.e., you are that),” Chānd. U., 6.8.7 and following). Others are: *ahaṃ brahmāsmi*, “I am Brahman;” *prajñānaṃ brahma*, “Consciousness is Brahman;” and *ayamātmā brahma*, “this self is Brahman.” Each of the four propositions is from one of the four Veda.

**māyā** See the entry for *avidyā*.

**mokṣa** Liberation. Liberation in Vedānta is the cessation of bondage to material life and its cyclic operations. Bondage is the result of ignorance and thus one ends bondage by gaining the right kind of knowledge, knowledge of the oneness of the self and Brahman, according to Advaita Vedānta. In Vaiṣṇava Vedānta, liberation is gaining entrance into the presence of the deity, Kṛṣṇa. This is attained through *bhakti* which in its early stages also involves knowledge.

**nāstika** See the entry for *āstika*.

**Paramātmān** The Highest Self or Super-self, a form of deity believed to be present with the living being in the heart. One of the three forms

of the absolute that are recognized in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (1.2.11). This is the form met in their meditation by those who practice *yoga*, according to the Vaiṣṇava Vedānta.

**preman** Divine love. The fifth and highest goal of human life according to the Vaiṣṇava Vedānta. It is the ultimate result of the cultivation of *bhakti*. Its various stages of intensification and expression are discussed in the works of Rūpa Gosvānin (16th cent.), especially the *Ujjvala-nīlamanī* (*Blazing Sapphire*).

**śakti** Power. Power in Vedānta is that which allows something to produce an effect or result. Its presence in the cause is inferred from the effect. Fire which is able to burn things is said to have the power of burning. In Advaita Vedānta ignorance is said to have two powers, a covering power and a projecting power. It first covers an object so that its true nature is not known and then projects something onto that object so that it appears as something else. The two effects, ignorance of the true nature of something and appearance as something else, lead the Advaitin to infer the presence of two powers. In Vaiṣṇava Vedānta, deity is said to have three powers — the internal power, the marginal power, and the external power. These correspond to the effects: the internal power to deity's own nature (eternal being, consciousness, and bliss), the marginal power to the living beings, and the external power to the material world.

**sannyāsa** Renunciation. Renunciation is the last of the four stages of life in the ideal Hindu life cycle. The first stage is student life (*brahmacarya*) in which one studies, practices celibacy, and serves the teacher. The second stage is householder life (*gṛhastha*) in which one marries, raises a family, and works at some occupation for one's livelihood. The third stage is retirement (*vānaprastha*) in which one hands over one's affairs to a son and retires with one's wife to a forest dwelling to cultivate religious attitudes. Renunciation is for the men of the highest caste and involves performing one's own funeral and leaving home to wander as a homeless mendicant. One is expected to cultivate detachment and strive for final liberation from the cycle of rebirth.

**sūtra** Short, aphoristic statement of a teaching of one of the schools of

Hindu philosophy. Each of the six major schools has a foundational work composed of *sūtra* that form the skeleton around which the philosophy of the school is built.

**taṭastha-śakti** The marginal power. This is the power that constitutes the living beings, also called the knowers of the field (*kṣetra-jñā*). It is called marginal because it sometimes comes under the influence of the external power and sometimes under the influence of the internal power. It is like a beach that is inundated by water during high tide. When inundated by the external power the living beings that are the expressions of the marginal power think they are part of the material world. When free from the influence of the external power they realize their proximity or similarity to the internal power and join with it to participate in the sacred realm. See *antaraṅga-śakti* and *bahiraṅga-śakti*.

**upādhi** An adjunct or characteristic. An *upādhi* is a limiting property that creates the illusion that Brahman is something other than Brahman, like a deity or the living being, according to the Advaita tradition.

**vaiśya** The third caste composed of merchants, farmers and artisans in the Hindu systems of castes (*varṇa*). See the entry for *brāhmaṇa*.

**Vedānta** The final parts of the Veda, i.e. the Upaniṣads and the views contained in them. Vedānta is also often described as the end or goal of the Veda, that is, the goal toward which Vedic culture directs mankind, that being freedom or liberation (*mokṣa*) as proposed in the Upaniṣads.

**viśeṣa** Differentiators or differentiating traits. *Viśeṣa* are traits that create the appearance of difference, but not real difference. The three powers of the deity, the internal, the marginal, and the external, are differentiators according to the Vaiṣṇava Vedānta of Baladeva. The effects they create, the essential natures of the absolute (eternal being, consciousness, and bliss), the living beings, and the manifest world appear as different, but are not really different from deity. In this way, the non-duality of the absolute, of the deity, is maintained.

**yoga** A set of practices, developed early in Indian history, to stabilize and slow the metabolism of the body in order to allow the mind to

concentrate without interruption in meditation. In its classical form there are eight parts to the practice. See the *Sāra*, paras. 137-145.

# Bibliography

- [[ 1 ]] Agehananda Bharati. *The Ochre Robe*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1970.
- [[ 2 ]] Bādarāyaṇa. *The Vedānta-sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa*, with the commentary of Baladeva, translated by Srisa Chandra Vasu. New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corp., 1979.
- [[ 3 ]] Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. *Prameya-ratnāvalī*, edited with his own commentary and the *Kānti-mālā* of Vedāntavāgīśa by Akṣaya Kumāra Śarmā Śāstrī. Calcutta: Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat, 1927.
- [[ 4 ]] Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. *Prameya-ratnāvalī*, edited with a Hindi trans. by Haridāsa Śāstrī. Kālīdaha, Vṛndāvana: Sad-granthaprakāśaka, 1981.
- [[ 5 ]] Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. *Siddhānta-ratna*, edited by Gopīnāth Kavirāja. 2 vols. Benares: Sarasvati Bhavan, 1924-27.
- [[ 6 ]] Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa. *Siddhānta-ratna*, edited by Bhaktivedanta Vamana Swami. Navadvīpa: Śrī Gauḍīya Vedānta Samiti, 1973.
- [[ 7 ]] Bataille, Georges. *Theory of Religion*, translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Zone Books, 1989.
- [[ 8 ]] Bhāratīrtha. *Pañcadaśī*, edited by Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara. Kalikātā: Sarasvatī Yantra, 1882.
- [[ 9 ]] Bhattacharya, Srimohan and Bhattacharya Śāstrī, Dinesh Chandra, eds. *Bhāratīya Darśana Koṣa*. Volume Three [First Part] (Vedānta). Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1981.

- ¶ 10 ¶ Bhattacharyya, Krishnachandra. *Studies in Philosophy*, edited by Gopinath Bhattacharyya, two volumes in one. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2nd rev.ed. 1983.
- ¶ 11 ¶ Carney, Gerald T. "Bābā Premānanda Bhāratī: a comparative study" in the *Journal of Vaiṣṇava Studies*, vol. 6, no. 2 (Spring 1998), pp. 161-188.
- ¶ 12 ¶ Chatterjee, Satishchandra and Datta, Dhirendramohan. *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1968.
- ¶ 13 ¶ Chattopādhyāya, Sunīlakumāra, ed. *Ekṭi Duṣprāpya Bāṃlā Gadya Puṁthi: Vedānta-sāra* (In Bengali). Shreerampur: Council of Shreerampur College, 1986.
- ¶ 14 ¶ Deutsch, Eliot. *Advaita Vedānta: a Philosophical Reconstruction*. Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1969.
- ¶ 15 ¶ Deutsch, Eliot and Buitenen, J.A.B. van. *A Source Book of Advaita Vedānta*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1971.
- ¶ 16 ¶ Dharmarājādhvarīndra. *Vedānta-paribhāṣā*, edited and translated into Bengali by Śrī Mohana Bhaṭṭācārya Tarkavedāntatīrtha. Kalkātā: Rāmakṛṣṇa Mission Institute of Culture, 1996.
- ¶ 17 ¶ Dharmarājādhvarīndra. *Vedānta-paribhāṣā*, edited with an English translation by S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri. Adyar, Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1971.
- ¶ 18 ¶ Eliade, Mircea. *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.
- ¶ 19 ¶ Flood, Gavin. *An Introduction to Hinduism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- ¶ 20 ¶ Fort, Andrew O. *Jīvanmukti in Transformation*. Albany: State University of New York, 1998.
- ¶ 21 ¶ Ghate, V. S. *The Vedānta*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Second Edition, 1960.



- [[ 22 ]] Hacker, Paul. *Philology and Confrontation*. Albany: State University of New York, 1995.
- [[ 23 ]] Hiriyan, M. *Essentials of Indian Philosophy*. Bombay: George Allen and Unwin (India) Private Limited, 1973.
- [[ 24 ]] Jīva Gosvāmin. *Tattva-sandarbhā*, edited and translated by Stuart Elkman. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986.
- [[ 25 ]] Kara, Minati. *Advaitavedānte Jñāna* Kalikata: Adityamaya, 1988.
- [[ 26 ]] Klostermaier, Klaus. *A Survey of Hinduism*. Albany: State University of New York, 2nd ed., 1994.
- [[ 27 ]] Madhusūdana Sarasvatī. *Siddhānta-bindu*, edited with an original commentary by Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 3rd ed., 1986.
- [[ 28 ]] Mahanamabrata Brahmachari. *Vaiṣṇava Vedānta*. Calcutta: Das Gupta and Co., 1974.
- [[ 29 ]] Mukhopadhyaya, Pramathanath. *Introduction to Vedānta Philosophy*. Calcutta: The Book Company, 1928.
- [[ 30 ]] *The Laws of Manu*, trans. by G. Bühler. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, repr. 1979.
- [[ 31 ]] Narang, Sudesh. *The Vaiṣṇava Philosophy of Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa*. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1984.
- [[ 32 ]] Olivelle, Patrick. *Upaniṣads*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- [[ 33 ]] Pereira, Jose. *Hindu Theology: a Reader*. New York: Image Books, 1976.
- [[ 34 ]] Potter, Karl, ed. *Advaita Vedānta up to Śaṅkara and his pupils. Encyclopedia of Indian philosophies* (Princeton, N.J.) vol. 3. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- [[ 35 ]] Pratyagatmananda Swami (Pramathanath Mukhopadhyaya). *The Metaphysics of Physics*. Madras: Ganesh & Co., 1964.

- ¶ 36 ¶ Sadānanda Yogīndra. *Vedānta-sāra*, edited by Medhacaitanya Brahmācari. Kalikātā: Śrī Rāmakṛṣṇa Vedānta Maṭha, 1980.
- ¶ 37 ¶ Sadānanda Yogīndra. *Vedānta-sāra*, edited and translated by M. Hiriyanna. Poona: Oriental Book Agency, 2nd. ed. 1962.
- ¶ 38 ¶ Sadānanda Yogīndra. *Vedānta-sāra of Sadānanda*, together with the commentaries of Nṛsiṃha Sarasvatī and Rāmatīrtha, edited by G. A. Jacob. Bombay: Tukārām Jāvajī, 1894.
- ¶ 39 ¶ Sadānanda Yogīndra. *Vedānta-sāra of Sadānanda*, translated by Swami Nikhilananda. Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama, 6th ed., 1990.
- ¶ 40 ¶ Sadānanda Yogīndra. *Vedānta-sāra of Sadānanda*. Srirangam: Sri Vani Vilas Press, 1911.
- ¶ 41 ¶ Sharma, Arvind. *The Experiential Dimensions of Advaita Vedanta*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1993.
- ¶ 42 ¶ Sharma, B. N. K. *History of the Dvaita School of Vedānta and its Literature* 2 vols. in one. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 3rd ed., 2000.
- ¶ 43 ¶ Sharma, B. N. K. *Philosophy of Śrī Madhvācārya*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, Rev. ed., 1986.
- ¶ 44 ¶ Wright, Michael and Wright, Nancy. "Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa: the Gauḍīya Vedāntist" in the *Journal of Vaiṣṇava Studies*, vol. 1, no. 2 (Winter 1993), pp. 158-184.

# The Sanskrit Alphabet

## Vowels: Svāra

According to traditional phonology, the sounds of the Sanskrit alphabet are produced at different places in the mouth starting more or less at the back of the mouth and moving forward: *a* and *ā* are pronounced in the throat, *i* and *ī* at the palate, *u* and *ū* a little in front of the palate, *ṛ* and *ṝ* with the tongue curled upward toward the roof of the mouth, *ḷ* and *ḹ* at the teeth, *e* at the palate, *ai* sliding from throat to palate, *o* at the lips, *au* sliding from throat to lips, and *aḥ* at the throat.<sup>20</sup>

अ — a, pronounced like “a” in “Roman,”

आ — ā, pronounced like “a” in “father,”

इ — i, pronounced like “i” in “it” or “pin,”

ई — ī, pronounced like “i” in “police,”

उ — u, pronounced like “u” in “push,”

---

<sup>20</sup>I am grateful to Ernest Massengale for creating the following charts and pronunciation examples. Some of the pronunciation examples have been taken from the fine introduction to Sanskrit called *Sanskrit: an easy introduction to an enchanting language* by Ashok Aklujkar. (Richmond, British Columbia: Svādhyāya Publications, 1992)

ऊ — ū, pronounced like “u” in “rude,”

ऋ — ṛ, pronounced like “er” in “fiber,”

ॠ — ṝ, pronounced like “ree” in “reel,”

लृ — ḷ, pronounced like “le” in “angle,”

लृ̄ — ḹ, pronounced like “lea” in “leash,”

ए — e, pronounced like “ay” in “way,”

ऐ — ai, pronounced like “ai” in “aisle,”

ओ — o, pronounced like “o” in “note,”

औ — au, pronounced like “ow” in “now,”

अं — aṁ, pronounced like “ung” in “rung,”

अः — aḥ, pronounced like “aha,”

## Consonants: Vyañjana

The consonants are all shown in combination with the short “a.” In Sanskrit, a consonant or conjunct is always understood to be followed by short “a” unless some other symbol is present.

## The Ka-varga

These velar consonants are all pronounced in the throat.

क — ka, pronounced like the “k” in “sky,”

ख — kha, pronounced like “c” in “cat,”

ग — ga, pronounced like the “g” in “gum,”

घ — gha, pronounced like the “gh” in “doghouse,”

ङ — ña, pronounced like “ng” in “sung,”

## The Ca-varga

These palatal consonants are all pronounced at the palate.

च — ca, pronounced like the “ch” in “church,”

छ — cha, pronounced like the “ch” in “chew,”

ज — ja, pronounced like “j” in “jump,”

झ — jha, pronounce this like “j” with a strong outward breath,”

ञ — ña, pronounced like “n” in “canyon,”

### The Ṭa-varga

These retroflex consonants are all pronounced with the tip of the tongue curled upward touching the roof of the mouth.

- ट — ṭa, pronounced like the “t” in “art” or “stop,”  
 ठ — ṭha, pronounced like the “th” in “boathouse,”  
 ड — ḍa, pronounced like “d” in “ardent” or “bird,”  
 ढ — ḍha, pronounce this like “dh” in “hardhat,”  
 ण — ṇa, pronounced like “n” in “yarn.”

### The Ta-varga

These dental consonants are all pronounced at the teeth.

- त — ta, pronounced like the “th” in “the,” “them” or the french word “tete (head),  
 थ — tha, pronounced like the above letter ‘t’, but with more aspiration,  
 द — da, pronounced like in the french word “donner” (to give),  
 ध — dha, pronounce this like “d” with a strong outward breath,  
 न — na, pronounced like “n” in “no,”

## The Pa-varga

These labial consonants are all pronounced with the lips.

प — pa, pronounced like the “p” in “spin,”

फ — pha, pronounced like the “ph” in “tophat,”

ब — ba, pronounced like “b” in “boat,”

भ — bha, pronounced like “bh” in “abhor,”

म — ma, pronounced like “m” in “mud,”

## The Semivowels

The sounds are divided thus; y is produced at the palate, r at the roof of the mouth, l at the teeth, and v at the lips.

य — ya, pronounced like the “y” in “yoga,”

र — ra, pronounced like the “r” in “relic,”

ल — la, pronounced like “l” in “land,”

व — va, pronounced like “v” in “vote,”

## The Sibilants

The sounds are divided thus; ś is produced at the palate, ṣ at the roof of the mouth, s at the teeth, and h at the throat.

श — śa, pronounced like the “sh” in “Swedish-chocolate,”

ष — ṣa, pronounced with tongue curled upward touching the roof of the mouth,

स — sa, pronounced like “s” in “sun,”

ह — ha, pronounced like “h” in “house,”

## Combining Vowels and Consonants

Most vowel consonant combinations follow the pattern shown here.

अ	+	क	=	क
आ	+	क	=	का
इ	+	क	=	कि
ई	+	क	=	की
उ	+	क	=	कु
ऊ	+	क	=	कु
ऋ	+	क	=	कृ
ॠ	+	क	=	कृ
ऌ	+	क	=	कृ
ॡ	+	क	=	कृ
ए	+	क	=	कै
ऐ	+	क	=	कै
ओ	+	क	=	को
औ	+	क	=	कौ



## Compound Consonants

Consonants following each other, not separated by a vowel, form conjuncts. Here are the most common of them.

क्क kka	क्ख kkha	क्च kca	क्ण kṇa	क्त kta	क्त्य ktya
क्त्र ktra	क्त्र्य ktrya	क्त्वा ktva	क्न kna	क्न्य knya	क्म kma
क्य kya	क्र kra	क्र्य krya	क्ल kla	क्वा kva	क्व्य kvya
क्ष kṣa	क्ष्म kṣma	क्ष्य kṣya	क्ष्व kṣva	क्ख्य khya	क्ख्र khra
ग्य gya	ग्र gra	ग्र्य grya	घ्न ghna	घ्न्य ghnya	घ्म ghma
घ्य ghya	घ्र ghra	ङ्क ṅka	ङ्क ṅta	ङ्क्य ṅktya	ङ्क्य ṅkya
ङ्क्ष ṅkṣa	ङ्क्ष्म ṅkṣma	ङ्क्ष्य ṅkṣya	ङ्क्ष्व ṅkṣva	ङ्ङ ṅga	ङ्ङ ṅgya
ङ्घ ṅgha	ङ्घ्र ṅghra	ङ्ङ ṅghra	ङ्ङ ṅna	ङ्ङ ṅna	ङ्ङ ṅma
ङ्य ṅya	च् cca	च्छ ccha	च्छ्र cchra	ञ cña	च्म cma
च्य cya	छ्य chya	छ्र chra	ज्ज jja	ज्ज्य jjha	ज्ञ jña
ज्ञ jña	ज्म jma	ज्य ज्या	ज्र jra	ज्व jva	ञ्म ñma
ञ्म ñma	ञ्य ñya	ञ्छ ñcha	ञ्ज ñja	ञ्ज्य ñjya	ट ṭa
त्य त्या	थ थ्या	ठ थ्र थ्रा	ङ्ग dga	ङ्ग्य dgya	ङ्घ dgha
ङ्घ dghra	ङ्घ्र dghra	ङ्ग dma	ङ्ग dya	ङ्ग dhya	ङ्घ dhra
ण्ट ṇ ṭa	ण्ठ ṇ ṭha	ण्ड ṇ ṭa	ण्ड्य ṇ ṭya	ण्ड्र ṇ ṭra	ण्ड्र्य ṇ ṭrya
ण्ड ṇ ṭha	ण्ण ṇ ṇa	ण्म ṇ ṇma	ण्य ṇ ṇya	ण्व ṇ ṇva	त्क tka
त्क्र tkra	त्त tta	त्य त्या	त्तृ ttra	त्त्व ttva	त्थ ttha
त्न tna	त्न्य tnya	त्प tpa	त्प्र tpra	त्म tma	त्म्य tmya
त्य त्या	त्र tra	त्र्य trya	त्व tva	त्स tsa	त्स tsna
त्स्न tsnva	थ्व thva	द्ग dga	द्ग dgra	द्घ dgha	द्घ dghra
द्ग dda	द्ग्य ddya	द्ध ddha	द्ध ddhya	द्ग dna	द्ग dba
द्घ dbha	द्घ्र dbhya	द्म dma	द्ग dya	द्ग dra	द्ग drya
द्घ dva	द्घ्य dvya	द्घ dhna	द्घ्य dhnya	द्घ्म dhma	द्घ्य dhya
द्घ्र dhra	द्घ्र्य dhrya	द्घ्व dhva	न्त nta	न्त्य ntya	न्त्र ntra
न्द nda	न्द्र ndra	न्ध ndha	न्ध्र ndhra	न्न nna	न्प npa
न्प्र npa	न्म nma	न्य nya	न्न nra	न्स nsa	त्त pta
त्य ptya	प् पना	प्प ppa	प्म pma	प्य pya	प्र pra
प्ल pla	प्व pva	प्स psa	प्स्व psva	ब्घ bgha	ब्ज bja
ब्द bda	ब्ध bdha	ब्ब bna	ब्ब bba	ब्म bbha	ब्भ्य bbhya
ब्भ bya	ब्ब bra	ब्ब bva	ब्भ bhna	ब्भ्य bhya	ब्भ bhra
भ्व bhva	म् मरा	म्प mpa	म्प्र mpra	म्ब mba	म्भ mbha
म्म mma	म्य mya	म्र mra	म्ल mla	म्व mva	य्य yya

यव yva	ल्क lka	ल्प lpa	ल्म lma	ल्य lya	ल्ल lla
ल्व lva	ल्ह lha	व् vna	व्य vya	व्र vra	व्व vva
श्च śca	श्च्य ścya	श्च śna	श्य śya	श्च śra	श्च्य śrya
श्ल śla	श्च śva	श्च्य śvya	श्श śśa	श् ष्टा	श्च्य ष्ट्या
ष्ट्र ṣṭra	ष्ट्र्य ṣṭrya	ष्ट्र ṣṭva	ष्ट्र ṣṭha	ष्ण ṣṇa	ष्ण्य ṣṇya
ष्प ṣpa	ष्प्र ṣpra	ष्म ṣma	ष्य ṣya	ष्व ṣva	स्क ska
स्व skha	स्त sta	स्त्य stya	स्त्र stra	स्त्व stv	स्थ stha
स्र sna	सन्य snya	स्प spa	स्फ spha	स्म sma	स्म्य smya
स्य sya	स्र sra	स्व sva	स्स ssa	ह्न hṇa	ह्न hna
ह्य hma	ह्य hya	ह्र hra	ह्ल hla	ह्व hva	